UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

A CRITIQUE OF SOME PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF THE MYSTICISM OF JACOB BOEHME

GEORGE MERVIN ALLEMAN

A THESIS

IN PHILOSOPHY

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PHILADELPHIA
1932

A CRITIQUE OF SOME PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF THE MYSTICISM OF JACOB BOEHME

A THESIS

IN PHILOSOPHY

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GEORGE MERVIN ALLEMAN

PHILADELPHIA

1932

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CONTENTS

I

Introduction—Definitions—Methods 5

II

Some Psychological Aspects of the Mysticism of Jacob Boehme ... 28

III

Some Pragmatic Aspects of the Mysticism of Jacob Boehme 45

IV

Ethical Philosophy in the Mysticism of Jacob Boehme 56

V

The Search of the Mystic Boehme for Ultimate Reality and Truth 75

VI

Summary and Conclusions 94

Notes, References and Source Material 99

Bibliography 126

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41550005_0008

I

Introduction—Definitions—Methods

The purpose of this thesis is to examine critically the mysticism of Jacob Boehme with reference to certain problems of Epistemology and Metaphysics. Epistemologists and metaphysicians have for their study, among other things, the ways or way in which reality may be known; while the mystics have as their aim the knowing of a reality frequently personified under the name of God. Are these two aims so very far apart? Is not the knowing of God similar to the knowing of reality? If the philosopher does succeed in finding the way in which we may know reality, would he not know God, too? The difference seems then to be largely one of attitude and method.

The specific problem before us at present is to determine what truths regarding ultimate reality or God are perceived by such mystics as Jacob Boehme and how we are to evaluate and judge their reports. Do the mystics have knowledge not possessed by others? Is their knowledge the same as that reached by others through reasoning and thought, or is it a mere hallucination? Can the mysticism of Jacob Boehme be explained upon psychological grounds or must it be defended upon pragmatic bases? Should we be unable to defend it upon such bases, then the problem remaining before us will be to determine what epistemological or philosophical criteria, if any, we might have for evaluating the truth or significance of the mysticism of Jacob Boehme.

But before comparing and criticizing some of the philosophical aspects of his mysticism, it is necessary to see what is meant by the term, for this mysticism to which we are hopefully looking for aid in answering the problem of how we may know reality, is a term that has had a great variety of connotations and at the present time the same word is used by various writers who intend to convey widely different ideas.

In popular usage the term is at times applied to any who seem to have a dreamy kind of outlook on life or who write poetry of a peculiarly incomprehensible variety. It is often confused

with occultism, magic or mere religious sentimentality. But it should, writes E. Underhill, be accepted as "the art or science of the spiritual life," as "the expression of the innate tendency of the human spirit towards complete harmony with the transcendental order; whatever be the theological formula under which the order is understood."[1] The same author points out that it tends to capture the whole field of consciousness, ending in a mystic union through a life-process tending towards the Absolute.

A somewhat broader view is taken by E. Lehmann.[2] He traces the growth of mysticism through savage people, through China, through India and through Europe. He considers the savage with his mystic rites, or magical rites, to be no less a mystic than the saint in the monastery, not so far advanced, but on the same road. Also the Hindu who meditates on the One is no less a mystic than those in the folds of the Catholic Church. Just as those whom we call philosophers in different ages have something in common, so these various seekers after a "something higher" have something in common and are grouped together by Lehmann as mystics.

At the other extreme, such a writer as A. B. Sharpe will consider those only to be mystics who are within the Church. However, in the case of Plotinus, the evidence of true mystical experience is so overwhelming that he grants its possibility in his case and falls back upon the idea of a "special dispensation". Jacob Boehme on the other hand is no true mystic; living outside the Church, his ideas could have been only "naturally" received, through having his mind fixed on the idea of God. For Sharpe, mysticism is supernatural and a special feature of the Church. "On its *natural side*," he says, "it is simply human. Mysticism is always recognizably the same thing, whether we meet it in Platonic or a Scholastic dress."[3] Between these extremes of the magic of the savage and the supernatural character connected with the Church we find a more tenable position in the mysticism of Jacob Boehme.

The definitions given by various writers are all quite similar in tendency, however, they may differ in instance and example. "Mysticism is the pretension to know God without intermediary."[4] "Mystical theology is the craving to be united again

with God."[5] "By mysticism we mean not the extravagance of an erring fancy, but the concentration of reason in feeling, the enthusiastic love of the Good, the True, the One."[6] Mysticism is "the type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence. It is religion in its most acute, intense, and living stage."[7]

A. Seth feels that mysticism is a phase of thought or feeling which from its very nature is hardly susceptible of exact definition. "It appears in connection with the endeavor of the human mind to grasp the Divine essence or the ultimate reality of things, and to enjoy the blessedness of actual communion with the highest."[8] Mystical phenomena have a philosophical side as well as a religious side, but "the thought that is most intensely present with the mystic is that of a supreme, all-pervading, and indwelling Power, in whom all things are one."[9] Seth points out that as a result the spiritual utterances of mysticism tend to be pantheistic in character. The mystics feel that direct intercourse with this Being of Beings, or God, is possible; for them "God ceases to be an object and becomes an experience." They all profess direct and divine illumination. This illumination, as we shall see later in more detail, is obtained by contemplation and self-surrender. By these and similar methods a knowledge of spiritual mysteries beyond human understanding is to be hoped for. Self-surrender is especially stressed by Jacob Boehme, but there is no hint of pantheism or loss of individuality.

In contrast with these definitions in which the notion of God is generally present in one form or another, those given by Von Hartmann and Bonchitte do not imply a necessary reference to divinity. Von Hartmann considers mysticism to be "the filling of the consciousness with a content (feeling, thought, desire), by an involuntary emergence of the same out of the unconscious."[10] Bonchitte takes it to consist "in giving to the spontaneity of the intelligence a larger part than to the other faculties."[11]

J. H. Leuba and others consider that the many definitions which might be given lend themselves to the same principle of grouping. These definitions reveal two explanations of mystical

phenomena, with some combining of the two on the part of more conservative individuals. The facts of inspiration, revelation and mystical experience may be referred to "God" as their cause; or they may be referred to a mental (not merely a nervous) activity of which the person is not aware, the so-called subconscious process. Or, finally, both these conceptions may be combined—God being supposed to make use of the subconscious in order to produce revelations in the human mind.[12]

Although the mystics generally speak of their aim as a personified reality considered to be God and strive for union with this personified being, in some cases (for example Buddhism) the First Reality is regarded merely as an abstract unity. This abstract unity or One is reached by the mystic who puts off one by one the husks and illusions of the world of appearances and phenomenal existence. With these illusions eliminated, union with the One is obtained. A few Christian mystics, too, tend in this direction, but most of them, including Jacob Boehme, retain the idea of union with a personal Deity. Such mysticism would evidently fall under definitions of the first type.

In this thesis we shall define mysticism as *the knowing and experiencing of God or Ultimate Reality in an intimate, intense and living way.* Although God is thus referred to as the cause or object of such experiencing, no "miracle" or even "supernatural" action is thereby implied. God uses the subconscious part of the individual, or other natural means and laws in order to reveal Himself in an intimate, intense and living manner.

But definitions are at times difficult to apply, and although necessary, they must be supplemented by various tests or criteria for proper evaluations. Such tests and criteria are especially necessary in the case of the greatly misunderstood word mysticism. Many such tests have been suggested. For example, William James offers four: (1) *Ineffability*, that is, the experience may not be imparted to another; (2) *Noetic quality*, that is, it is a state of knowledge; (3) *Transiency*; (4) *Passivity*.[13] The application of these criteria may simplify the problem by excluding from further consideration the admittedly non-mystical experiences of life. They do not help us greatly; we have left on our hands all the familiar difficulties of the scientist in handling his material.

To begin with, our material is to have the quality of ineffability, i.e. it is not to be imparted. The mystic's report of the experience is the only thing we have in the way of datum. But the experience is one which he may not describe, how then can we interpret it? The "facts" dealt with are plastic—the interpretation of the description of the experience. The typical mystic describes his experience in most poetical and glowing terms. Then he tells us that no descriptions can be given, that we must experience this mystical relation with God for ourselves.

The second test of the mystical experience examines into the noetic quality; it is to be a state of knowledge. The mystic feels that he knows God beyond any possible question and this element is necessary to any experience to be called mystical. But here again, how difficult to distinguish between the true and the false; how easy to *think* one knows with certainty; sincerely to describe one's experience as a knowing, and yet be completely deceived!

As to the third test, all are agreed that the mystic moment is transient. It comes and it goes; if in a few instances it seems to have lasted for days, this is most unusual. Finally, the experiencer is indeed a passive receiver as far as our present understanding of the phenomena lets us know. He cannot force it, and the same meditation or attitude that in one case is fruitful of mystical experiences, may in another be void of any such results. The mystic is not able to enter the state at will.

James is not the only one to have formulated tests of the mystical. E. Underhill offers five rules or notes which may be applied as tests to any given case which claims to take rank among the mystical. First, mysticism is practical; not theoretical. Second, mysticism is an entirely spiritual activity. Third, the business and method of mysticism is Love. Fourth, mysticism is never self-seeking. Fifth, mysticism entails a definite psychological experience.[14] "That is to say, it shows itself not merely as an attitude of mind and heart, but as a form of organic life. It is not a theory of the intellect or a hunger, however passionate, of the heart: but a definite and peculiar development of the whole self, conscious and unconscious, under the spur of such hunger: a remaking of the whole character on high levels in the interests of

the transcendental life. The mystics are emphatic in their statement that spiritual desires are useless unless they involve the movement of the whole self towards the Real."[15]

With the five criteria offered it seems to me that it would still be difficult to make any test which would show whether or not there was a "definite and peculiar development of the whole self . . . a remaking of the whole character on high levels in the interests of the transcendental life!" This idea will be referred to again in connection with the pragmatic and ethical implications of the mysticism of Jacob Boehme.

Bertrand Russell takes a very broad view of mysticism. His general position is that as a way of *feeling* it has "something of great value to contribute to life, but that as a way of thinking it is a source of error."[16] The mystic is characterized as one tending toward a general doubt concerning the reality of outward things; as having a "belief in insight as against discursive analytic knowledge." The mystic also feels that he has found a way to wisdom which is "sudden, penetrating, coercive" in contrast with the "fallible study of outward appearance by a science relying wholly upon the senses."[17] The senses are viewed as "blind guides leading to the morass of illusion. Closely connected with this belief is the conception of a Reality behind the world of appearance and utterly different from it."[18] This reality is that which the mystics worship, generally in a personified form as was previously mentioned. A second characteristic of mysticism according to Mr. Russell is "its belief in unity, and its refusal to admit opposition or division anywhere." A third mark is the "denial of the reality of Time." This is, of course, in accord with the second characteristic, namely, the refusal to admit any division. ". . . If all is one, the distinction of past and future must be illusory." So far we can agree, but a further characteristic is not true, at least not of most of the Christian Mystics. Mr. Russell says, "the last of the doctrines of mysticism which we have to consider is its belief that all evil is mere appearance, an illusion produced by the division and oppositions of the analytic intellect. Mysticism does not maintain that such things as cruelty, for example, are good, but it denies that they are real: they belong to that lower world of phantoms from which we are

to be liberated by the insight of the vision."[19] Evil for many of the mystics, including Boehme, is a very real thing and their moral strivings and their seeking to overcome sin provide one of the most striking things in the lives of the mystics, release from these temptations and a measure of peace being finally obtained by the mystic union with their God or what they call God—pragmatically and ethically the result being similar.

Royce emphasizes as one criterion this feeling of unity and oneness which is such a large element in mysticism. The mystic has contact with the real and to be real "means to be in such wise Immediate that, in the presence of this immediacy, all thought and all ideas, absolutely satisfied, are quenched, so that the finite search ceases, and the Other is no longer another, but is absolutely found. The object which fulfills this definition, and which is therefore worthy to be called real, is of necessity in itself One and only One; since variety, when consciously faced, calls forth thought, and arouses demands for characterization and explanation."[20]

Of course, even though no mystic has attained this ideal, "the case of the mystic must not stand or fall with his personal perfection, or with his winning of the Other, but with the inner consistency of his definition, and its adequacy to express th constitution of our search for truth."[21] We shall refer to Royc again in various other connections.

Schelling states that "Mysticism can only be called the spiritual state (Geistesbeschaffenheit) which turns with contempt (verschmäht) from all scientific basis, or even discussion, and regards all truth as springing from a so-called inner and not at all universal, but rather individual light; from immediate revelation; from simple ecstatic intuition or simple feeling."[22] Now although *immediacy* is certainly an element in mysticism, it cannot be called its definite essence, as "practically the immediacy of nearly all religious and even aesthetic feeling defies in like manner scientific analysis, and the artist trusts to the immediate musical revelation, the poet to the rapture of poetic ecstasy, the prophet to the profound sense of divine revelation for reaching his type of truth in thought or conduct."[23]

Mysticism is likewise more than mere sentimental piety.

It is both a *goal* and a *method* of reaching that goal. Once the goal is apprehended the various types of mysticism may be conveniently classified according to the ways taken to attain their end. T. A. Hall points out that "the main element in a satisfactory definition of mysticism must therefore be found in its fundamental purpose. And once this purpose is firmly grasped it may be clearly seen how a narrow stream of classic mysticism flows steadily down the history of thought, now widening out and losing itself seemingly in a general religious demand for immediacy of vision, and personal experience, but whenever it comes to self-consciousness we find it stating again its essential purpose with insistent and decisive clearness. This purpose is *metaphysical union with the source of all Being*, the identification of the soul with the very substance of God."[24]

By using the word "metaphysical," Hall considers that a sharp division is made between classic mysticism and simple religious longing for union with God. According to this, mysticism is not merely religious surrender to a Divine Will, but rather the actual metaphysical "swallowing" up of the individual life, however defined, in the *All*. The phenomenal individual disappears and is absorbed into the universal source of all Being, the separation between the phenomenal and the true source of all things is recognized and in the mystical experience this separation must be overcome. In Boehme we shall see that the surrendering to the Divine Will is the important thing, but yet as previously mentioned, without any loss of individuality.

This metaphysical union of Hall is viewed in a somewhat similar light by Woodbridge Riley. Speaking of Boehme, Riley takes occasion to say, " . . . nor was he modest in his speculative opinions. A comparison with a more modern thinker will show this. According to Kant we dwell on an island of the phenomenal, surrounded by the fog bank of the noumenal, that is, we dwell amidst appearances which we know, but we do not know things in themselves. Yet Boehme presumed to grasp the latter."[25] What are some of the methods used by him and the other mystics to reach their goal, i.e., the noumenal?

There is a phenomenal dualism which is a present evil to be overcome before this goal of the interpenetration of the essence

of things can be attained by the mystic. Now conceptual abstraction is one of the greatest aids to the human mind in organizing and mastering the manifold in its infinite variety, and accepting one interpretation of Plato's theory of Ideas, we can say that he had an almost superstitious worship of the conceptual machinery as a means for superseding the phenomenal experience of the manifold. But the mystic goes even further and attempts not only to transcend the phenomenal manifold, "but even the conceptual machinery by which the manifold is organized as knowledge, and by pure abstraction gain its end apart from the phenomenal altogether."[26]

Hall would distinguish clearly between "Ascetic Mysticism" and "Speculative Mysticism" which attempts to transcend the phenomenal world not by mere ascetic treatment of the body, but by mental abstraction and exercise of the will. In all cases of mysticism there is a world-weariness which is probably due to this despair of the tentative, relative and hesitating approach to truth that is alone possible to the relative empiricist. Three classifications of mystics may be made; namely, (a) those in whom world-weariness has a profoundly intellectual cast and the overcoming of doubt and the realization of truth is to be attained by transcending the intellectual process in speculation, e.g. Neoplatonism and Gnosticism; (b) those in whom the emotions and feelings are emphasized, e.g. the German mystics and (c) those emphasizing ritual, i.e. abstraction from the phenomenal by means of rite, asceticism and submission. In other words, by acts of will, the will is transcended and passivity attained. But in all true mysticism these things are but means to the end. "Neither speculation nor ecstasy, nor yet obedience to authority, has per se any merit, all are but methods of attaining the supreme purpose, namely, absorption of the individual and finite into the infinite, and thus attainment of ultimate metaphysical union with God."[27] Speculation, ecstasy, rapture, emotional surrender are all means of transcending and escaping from the limits of personality. Phenomenal dualism is overcome by "divine absorption into the all"; by a surrender to the divine will.

In Jacob Boehme there is this element of world-weariness or melancholy resulting from his consideration of Church strife and

the loss of human souls. He himself found the Bible his source of light and comfort, and so was grieved when the Protestant ecclesiastics of his time battled among themselves and attempted to prove their positions by "Articles of Faith" rather than by Scripture. Boehme teaches a complete surrender of the will to God as the solution of religious as well as social difficulties. This is a volitional as well as an emotional surrender, but there is absolutely nothing weak, craven, sentimental or effeminate in the mysticism of Boehme. His volitional and emotional surrender enabled him the better to battle "the world, the flesh and the devil". Furthermore, through this surrender God is apprehended and by apprehending God, the world also may be apprehended. Of course, man fails fully to comprehend God, and hence the world, because of the fall.

Boehme insists that it is only in the Spirit of God that we can search the depths of God and that it is as unreasonable to expect to apprehend God without God as to expect to see the sun except by means of the sun itself. The God sought by Boehme is always the revealed God of the Church and Christianity, a God of absolute holiness and love, whose depths he desires to explore. It should be noted that Boehme attaches a mystic significance to all the history of the Bible and a deeper meaning to all the sacraments of the Church, but he could sincerely accept every article of faith of the Lutheran Church.

Several extracts will serve to illustrate his interpretation of the inner mystical meaning of the scriptures. Writing of the Patriarch Jacob he says that Jacob was in a servile condition twenty years, till he had begat the Twelve Stocks of the Twelve Tribes. So is the Christian born under the servile yoke of the domineering self Adamical will, and their being begotten in servitude shows God's children are but strange guests here, but shall go out with great riches.[28] And again Boehme writes that Potiphar having bought Joseph, set him over his whole house; so must the Christian let the Government be Christ, then shall his twenty pieces of silver become thirty pieces, viz; the Adamical Humanity be exalted.[29] Joseph's brethren stand here in the figure of the truly converted Christian. Joseph is the wrath of God in nature. The cup is that of Christ's sufferings. Thus, Joseph's brethren, viz.

the Christian, are by the wrath of God in the fleshly evil nature, the evil world and the devil accused of having stolen the silver cup of Christ's sufferings, and though innocent, do give themselves up to suffer bonds, servitude, shame and death.[30] No doubt these little mystic morals can be read into all phases of Old Testament history, but there is no need to hide the real beauty of these stories under allegorical interpretations; however, it is necessary to include them in order to make his general method clear.

Boehme's constant wish is to stir up a desire for higher things in all his readers; a desire to have them likewise experience these deeper meanings. "Seeing then that my knowledge has been received by seeking and knocking, I therefore write it down for a memorial, that I might occasion a desire in any to seek after it, and thereby my talent might be improved, and not be hid in the earth. But I have not written this for those that are wise beforehand, that know all things, and yet know and comprehend nothing, for they are fully satisfied already, and rich; but I have written it for the simple, as I am, that I may be refreshed with those that are like myself."[31]

We can see further into the meaning and method of Boehme's mysticism in a similar statement in a later work. "Dear Children of God, let us heartily and seriously consider, from whence we are, and whither we are to go, and what we do and purpose, that we may not lose the eternal and highest good; wherefore do we so very much labour after temporary pleasure and voluptuousness, after honour, money, and goods? Are we not in this world strange guests, and pilgrims, which should continually expect when this life shall end? We are not created for the pleasure and lust of this life, but for paradisiacal joy, and to lead a simple child-like life; we should not know of any pomp, state, or haughtiness, but live together as children in a loving spirit of joy; we are gone out from our true, pure, paradisiacal mother, in whom we should live as dear and loving children."[32]

This inner knowledge and meaning is not to be obtained through reason and he cites Adam and Lucifer as examples of the result of following reason and our own light. "But while self, that is, reason, is ensnared and fast bound in a close and strong person, namely, in the anger of God, and in earthliness, it is very

dangerous for a man to make use of the light of knowledge in self, as if it were in the possession of self."[33]

Man's mind "ought not to enter upon any speculation in divine, or in the ground or foundation of human matters; not to will and desire anything but the grace of God in Christ; and as a child continually longs after the breasts of the mother, so must its hunger continually enter into the love of God, and not suffer itself to be broken off from this hunger by any means, when the outward reason triumphs in the light, saying, I have the true child; but then the will of the desire must bow itself down to the earth, and bring itself into the deepest humility and simple ignorance, and say, thou art foolish, and hast nothing but the grace of God; thou must wrap thyself up into that with great humility, and become nothing at all in thyself, and neither know nor love thyself; all that thou hast, or is in thee must esteem itself as nothing but a mere instrument of God, and then must bring the desire only in God's mercy, and go forth from all thy own knowing and willing, and esteem it as nothing at all, nor must thou ever entertain any will to enter into it again."[34] Boehme goes on to point out that with the will thus relying on God, and this mystic harmony with Him, the devil's attacks are weakened and as the Holy Spirit then takes possession of the life, the new man follows in joy and humility. In this joyful state the soul may behold what it is in time and eternity, for all is present before it.[35]

A commentator writes of Boehme that "his speculation streams forth from the deepest practical inspiration, for he has fled to the Heart of God in order to hide himself from the fury and tempest of the Devil. And, in the course of his metaphysical elucidations of the Being of God, he glances aside at the terrible Fall of Lucifer and Adam, and exhorts men to work out their salvation with fear and trembling. This practical momentum, this reference to salvation with which Boehme's speculations are saturated, may be regarded as the mystical element in him. But it is Protestant ethical mysticism, not pantheistic mysticism, as is so frequently the case with the mediaeval mystics."[36] All his mysticism was intensely practical and his constant aim is the union of the individual soul with God, a union of loving harmony brought about

by prayer, and detachment from the world. It should be noted that his was a *real detachment* from the world and not a mere *running away*, for even in the midst of his greatest periods of illumination he kept faithfully at his humble duties. This is in interesting contrast to the state of "coma" so common to many mystics in times of illumination.

This detachment or running away is manifested by some mystics even to the extent of showing hostility to nature. For example Tauler once passed through the convent garden, and drew his cap over his eyes so that the flowers might not disturb him in his abstractly spiritual meditations.[37] But Boehme tells us that he enjoyed wandering among the flowers in the field because he was enabled to see how everything sprouts, grows and blooms in the living and all-replenishing power of God. He tells of one of his first mystical experiences which took place when he was twenty-five years of age. As he was seated one day in his room gazing at a pewter dish reflecting the dazzling light of the sun, he fell into an inward ecstasy in which it seemed that he could see into the most secret nature and deepest principles of things. But as he distrusted his vision he walked out into the fields in hopes of banishing it from his thoughts. Here again the inward light persisted and he could see into the hidden meaning of the herbs and flowers of the field. In this experience he seemed to see into the very heart of the universe. He kept his experience to himself for many years and worked hard at his shoemaking.

Some ten years later he had a similar experience, although this time he saw even deeper into the heart of things. Of this later experience he wrote to a friend: "I saw and knew the Being of all Beings, the Byss (Grund) and the Abyss: the birth of the Holy Trinity; the origin and primal state of this world and of all creatures through the Divine Wisdom. I knew and saw in myself all the three worlds,—i.e. first, the divine angelic or paradisiacal world; then second, the dark world, as the original of nature, as to the fire; and third, this external visible world, as a creation and outbirth, or as a substance spoken forth out of the two inner spiritual worlds. Moreover, I saw and had cognizance of the whole Being in good and evil—how each had its origin in the other, and how the Mother did bring forth;—and this all moved

me not merely to the height of wonder, but made me to rejoice exceedingly.

"Soon it came strongly into my mind that I should set the same down in writing, for a memorial, albeit I could hardly compass the understanding thereof in my external man, so as to write it on paper. I felt that with such great mysteries I must set to work as a child that goes to school. In my inward man I saw it well, as in a great deep, for I saw right through as into a chaos in which everything lay wrapped, but the unfolding thereof I found impossible.

"Yet from time to time it opened itself within me, as in a growing plant. For the space of twelve years I carried it about within me—was, as it was, pregnant therewith, feeling a mighty inward impulse, before I could bring it forth in any external form; till afterwards it fell upon me, like a bursting shower that hitteth wheresoever it lighteth, as it will. So it was with me, and whatsoever I could bring into outwardness that I wrote down.

"Thereafter the sun shone on me a good while, yet not steadily and without interval, and when that light had withdrawn itself I could scarce understand my own work. And this was to show man that his knowledge is not his own, but God's, and that God in man's soul knoweth what and how he will.

". . . For hundreds of times have I prayed Him that if my knowledge were not for his glory and the edifying of my brethren, He should take it from me, only keeping me in His love. But I have found that with all my earnest entreaty the fire within me did burn the more, and it is in this glow, and in this knowledge, that I have produced my works . . . "[38]

And again he says, "Let no man conceive of me more highly than he here seeth, for the work is none of mine; I have it only in that measure vouchsafed me of the Lord; I am but his instrument wherewith he doeth what he will. This, I say, my dear friend, once for all, that none may seek in me one other than I am, as though I were a man of high skill and intellect, whereas I live in weakness and childhood, and the simplicity of Christ. In that child's work which he hath given me is my pastime and my play; 'tis there I have my delight, as in a pleasure-garden where stand many glorious flowers; therewith will I make myself

glad awhile, till such time as I regain the flowers of Paradise in the new man."[39]

The mysticism and mystical method of Jacob Boehme may be made clearer by a brief comparison with a very similar mystic, namely, Ruysbroeck. The mystic life is far from being regarded by Ruysbroeck as a dreamland into which material necessities and moral struggles disappear under the light of interior illumination. "Other mystics may lose foothold, take no account of human weakness; our philsopher retains close contact with life. Nowhere does Ruysbroeck set forth the spiritual life as an easy path."[40] There are seven characteristics or stages in the mystic life according to him, namely, the identification of our will with the divine will; voluntary poverty; purity of soul and chastity of body; the intimate consciousness of our own business; delight in God alone; a clear intuition into purity of thought; not knowing in limitless repose.[41] These seven characteristics are to be found as well in the mysticism of Boehme.

The mysticism and mystical method of Boehme may be made still clearer by comparison with another mystic who was greatly influenced by Boehme. The circumstances surrounding the mystical experiences of George Fox were quite similar to those of Jacob Boehme. "Just at the time when Fox was undergoing his particular period of storm and stress in finding his higher coordinations during his late adolescence, there began to appear in England translations of the writings of the German mystic, Jacob Boehme. Muggleton says these books were the chief books bought by the followers of Fox. Rufus M. Jones thinks that Fox was more directly influenced by Boehme than by any other mystic. He was a man without scholastic training even as Fox. Like Fox, he found his great illumination at the end of a period of long and earnest travail of soul 'striving to find the heart of Jesus Christ and to be freed and delivered from anything that turned him away from Christ'. He had resolved to 'put his life to the greatest hazard,' when suddenly 'the gate was opened'. Then he 'saw and knew the Being of Beings, the Byss and Abyss, the eternal generation of the Trinity, the origin and descent of this world and of all creatures through Divine Wisdom'. Fox, having it opened to him that he must 'forsake all

and be as a stranger to all', came to see that 'there is one, even Christ Jesus, that could speak to his condition'. The 'Lord gently led him along and let him to see His love, which was endless and eternal, surpassing all the knowledge that men have in the natural state, or can obtain from history or books'. That love let him see himself as he was without God. It is not alone in such similarities of experience, however, that Fox and Boehme resemble each other. They both share a belief in the infinite power of Light which is at war with the principle of Darkness, and in the 'doctrine that man is an epitome, a microcosm . . . possessed within by the same Spirit and Divine Reason that reveals Himself in large in the macrocosm or world system'. Fox shows a tendency to allegorize or spiritualize the Scriptures in much the same fashion as Boehme does."[42]

We have seen that the mystical method of Boehme is essentially empirical. He actually experiences and knows God or Ultimate Reality in an intimate, intense and living way. He and the other mystics have frequently urged others to make the same empirical attempt to experience God. Josiah Royce speaks of the mystics as the only thorough-going empiricists in the history of philosophy. For the mystic, God is not to be known through logic or fine reasoning, but through actual experiencing of what the mystic considers to be God. For the philosopher, the attempt to know reality is an intellectual process; for the mystic, the knowing of God is an actual experience. ". . . Nobody, I must hold, can understand a large part of human nature without understanding Mysticism . . . That the mystic is dealing with experience, and trying to get experience quite pure and then to make it the means of defining the real is what we need to observe. That meanwhile the mystic is a very abstract sort of person I well admit. But he is usually a keen thinker. Only he uses his thinking sceptically, to make naught of other thinkers. He gets his reality not by thinking, but by consulting the data of experience. He is not stupid. And he is trying, very skilfully, to be a pure empiricist."[43]

The mystics, such as Boehme, tell us to look deeper into the real nature of things, into the interior of experience, beyond mere colors and sounds, beyond any ordinary and particular

immediacy, deeper than mortal love; and then when rightly prepared, we "shall find a fact, an immediate and ineffable fact, such that it wholly satisfies every longing, answers every inquiry, and fulfills the aim of every thought. And this it will do for you just because it will be at last the pure immediate, with no beyond to be sought."[44] The mystic insists that here is the absolutely pure datum for which we have been seeking and will bring an end to all the strifes and conflicts in our thinking, for only in this immediate, in this reality of which there is no beyond, will we have peace.

The mystic is a genius in his particular way. We all have the same ability for perceiving this transcendent reality (so the mystic tells us) which he possesses in a greater degree. The real, the ineffably immediate, is always present, but we do not experience it; while the mystic claims that he does. The mystics and their followers tell us that this experiencing is in the nature of a "homeward journey of man's spirit" due "to the push of a divine life within answering to the pull of a divine life without. It is the going of like to like, the fulfilment of a Cosmic necessity: and the mystics, in undertaking it, are humanity's pioneers on the only road to rest."[45] Récéjac likewise points out the fact that the mystic is *impelled* by a desire to know and a desire to love. He also desires the principles of things as they are in God. Now this desire is not one of mere curiosity nor self-interest toward God, the sum of all things, but more in the nature of an inward urge.[46]

But the mystics do not move in a straight line toward their goal nor do they seem to remain long in the presence of this transcendent reality. There is alternating sunshine and shade as the soul ascends the spiral of its road toward reality. "The first thing we notice about this composite portrait is that the typical mystic seems to move towards his goal through a series of strongly marked oscillations between 'states of pleasure' and 'states of pain'. The existence and succession of these states—sometimes broken and confused, sometimes crisply defined—can be traced, to a greater or less degree, in almost every case of which we possess anything like a detailed record."[47]

This alternating sunshine and shade as the soul ascends the spiral of its road toward reality is evident in Boehme. As he

grew older the element of sunshine became greater, but his periods of illumination were divided by periods of depression. The degree of illumination and the light revealed increased by degrees, although the essentials of his system were revealed to him in his first work. Even at times of illumination there were certain elements of truth which were still obscure, man being unable fully to comprehend the truth because of the fall.[48] For him as well as other mystics this experiencing of God is to be viewed as a vista which is opened gradually to the climber of the ladder which figuratively reaches from earth to heaven and must be climbed step by step. Love and desire to know God and Reality are the first requisites in order to be able to climb this ladder.

Some have thought that this experience of the mystic is more like an Hegelian triad than a climb up a ladder of alternating sunshine and shadow, there really being three parts to each successive experience. Pratt suggests this and says, "The three periods thus form . . . a beautiful example of the Hegelian triad, with the simple joy of ecstasy as the thesis, the deeper pain of separation from God and self-despair as the antithesis, and the 'apostolic life' of guided activity as the synthesis, in which all that was best in the other two is 'aufgehoben,' taken up, transformed, glorified."[49]

Mystics have often spoken of the scala perfectionis, or ladder of perfection, and divide it into three rungs or grades. We saw that Ruysbroeck divided it into seven stages, although some other mystics divide it into five stages. The first is known as the *Purgative Stage.* This includes such things as contrition, an attempt to become detached from the things of sense. It is the rough road over which the prisoners in Plato's "Cave of Illusion" must struggle in order to reach the mouth of the cave. It involves restraint and self-denial, but results in the second stage called *Illumination.* The prisoner of the "Cave of Illusion" now looks upon the sun of truth. He is blinded by it and cannot see it completely or really as it is. It is merely a vision of the Absolute, bringing happiness and a sense of the Divine Presence to be sure, but only a necessary stage before the final one of *Union,* in which the mystic sees only the Absolute, enjoys Its

illumination, and is one with It. "It is a state of equilibrium, of purely spiritual life; characterized by peaceful joy, by enhanced powers, by intense certitude . . . Union must be looked upon as the true end of mystical education, the permanent condition of life upon transcendent levels of Reality, of which ecstacies give a foretaste to the soul. Intense forms of it, described by individual mystics, under symbols such as those of Mystical Marriage, Deification, or Divine Fecundity, all prove on examination to be aspects of this same experience seen through a temperament."[50]

Prayer, meditation and good works are needed for the climb up the ladder. God for the mystics is immanent in creation and hence it should be possible to see Him there. The particular theology makes little difference, the method is the same—a transcendence of normal consciousness through preparation for the "climb" up the scala perfectionis. Preparation and training are necessary in order to see reality, just as for the scientist to see properly through the microscope and understand what is seen. The mystic trains his Spirit to understand just as we train our minds to understand.

The seeker's motives must be of the highest. Jacob Boehme tells us "Now if any one would search the Divine Ground, that is, the Divine Revelation, he must first consider with himself, for what end he desires to know such things; whether he desires to practice that which he might obtain, and bestow it to the Glory of God and the welfare of his neighbour; and whether he desires to die to earthliness, and to his own will, and to live in that which he seeks and desires, and to be one spirit with it."[51] Further preparation is necessary before the first real step up the ladder may be made. "Therefore all fictions and devices to come to God by, let them have what name soever they will, which men contrive and invent for ways to God, are lost labour, and unprofitable, without a new mind. There is no other way to God but a new mind, which turns from wickedness, and enters into repentence for the sins it has committed; that goes out from its iniquity, and wills it no more, but wraps its will up in the death of Christ, and with all earnestness dies from the sin of the soul in the death of Christ."[52]

Boehme is very insistent on this first stage of *purgation*; both an inward and an outward purgation of evil are necessary. Hypocrisy, flattery, and verbal forgiveness, avail nothing; we must be children, not by outward imputation, but born of God from within, in the new man, which is resigned in God. "All such flattering of ourselves, in saying, Christ has paid the ransom, and made satisfaction for sin, He is dead for sins: if we also do not in Him die from sin, and put on His merit in new obedience, and live therein, all is false, and a vain frivolous comfort."[53] And again he insists upon purity of thought and act if we would reach God. "For if the eye of the soul be light, then the whole body in all its members. Now if any boast himself to be the child of God, and yet suffers the body to burn in sins, he is not yet capable of being a child, but lies captive in the fetters of the devil, in great darkness: and if he do not find in himself an earnest will burning in him of well-doing in love, then his pretence is but an invention of reason, proceeding from self, which cannot see God, unless it be born anew, and show forth in its power and virtue that it is His child: for there is no fire but has light in it: and if the divine fire be in the mind, it will shine forth, and the mind will do that which God will have done."[54]

A man must wrestle long in this first elementary stage of purgation. He "must pray earnestly, with great humility, and for a while become a fool in his own reason, and see himself as void of understanding therein, until Christ be formed in this new incarnation."[55] For the second part of the purgative stage, the seeker must learn to rise above reason and having achieved a certain negative goodness, that is, having left gross sins of the flesh behind, he must seek to do God's will in all things. Boehme says of this step in growth that we must go out from our reasonings in the fleshly spirit, and bring our heart, mind, and thoughts, wholly into the obedience of God, and yield ourselves to God's will, not feigning ways of our own reason, or asking where Christ is. We must direct our way into Christ, and know for certain that Christ is in our hearts. We must submit ourselves to Him in great humility, casting all our purposes and doings into His will and pleasure, and consider that we always stand in the presence of God and that Christ sits at the right hand of God in us. We

must consider that we stand every moment before the holy number Three and that God always examines and sees into the most secret recesses of our heart. We must take heed not to enter into any deep thought or searching, but merely into His love and mercy: and resolve never to go out from it any more, but ever to continue therein. The seeking mystic must give himself wholly up to God, this being the greatest and most important thing. If there is this surrender, then the Spirit will teach the seeker what to say, and give mind and knowledge, and understanding.

With this yielding there comes a new peace and strength. A new center and unifying factor is found in Christ and obedience to God. The mystic may then receive illumination through the grace of God, but to grow in knowledge it is necessary for the mystic to "search after the heart, and after the spirit of the Scriptures" that it might be born in him, and that he might open the center of the love of God, and so he might know God, and rightly speak of Him. "For from the history none should take upon him to be a master, or call himself a knower of the Essence of God, but from the Holy Ghost, which appeareth in another principle (in the center of man's life) into those that seek it in true earnestness, as we are commanded by Christ to knock and seek for it of his Father (viz., in the center of the life) with true earnest desirous humility, and we shall find it."[56]

We have already offered a general definition of mysticism and having now considered various criteria and methods, we can give a more complete definition or brief description of the mysticism of Jacob Boehme. It may be characterized as follows: The mysticism of Jacob Boehme is the knowing of God and His love, and hence the essence and inner meaning of all things, through Christ and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; God and His love being experienced through a trusting surrender to His will which includes the leading of a humble, loving, practical and moral life. When these conditions are met, God's grace will do the rest. It is an empirical attempt to know God and reality. The way is open for all who meet the conditions and although the results cannot be fully communicated, the method can.

How is this experiencing possible? What are the basic factors? Boehme answers that this is possible because the true self is of

the Spirit of God and hence can see God. The spirit of man has not merely come from the stars and the elements, but there is hidden within him a spark of the light and the power of God. The soul, he tells us, searches into the Godhead and also into the depths of nature, for she has her fountain and origin in the whole of the divine Being. Even as the eye of man reaches the stars wherefrom it has its primitive origin, likewise the soul penetrates and sees even within the divine state of being wherein she lives.[57]

It is desirable to summarize our introductory material, first, for mysticism in general, using the clear, concise summary by Inge for this purpose, and secondly, to summarize the mysticism of Jacob Boehme, borrowing a summary directly from his own writings for this purpose.

Inge summarized the basic claims of the methods of mysticism as follows:

"*First*, the soul (as well as the body) can see and perceive . . . We have an organ or faculty for the discernment of spiritual truth, which, in its proper sphere, is as much to be trusted as the organs of sensation in theirs.

"The *second* proposition is that, since we can only know what is akin to ourselves, man, in order to know God, must be a partaker of the Divine nature . . . The Divine spark already shines within us, but it has to be searched for in the innermost depths of our personality, and its light diffused over our whole being."

Third proposition: "Without holiness no man may see the Lord . . . Sensuality and selfishness are absolute disqualifications for knowing 'the things of the Sprit of God'."

Fourth proposition: Love for God. "The mystic makes it his life's aim to be transformed into the likeness of Him in whose image he was created."[58]

Boehme has also well summarized his basic suggestions of the methods and meaning of mysticism in "A Dialogue between a Scholar and his Master concerning the Supersensual Life." This is one of his more mature works and is accordingly more valuable from our point of view.

"The disciple said to his master: Sir, how may I come to the supersensual life, so that I may see God, and may hear God speak?

"The master answered and said: Son, when thou canst throw thyself into *THAT*, where no creature dwelleth, though it be but for a moment, then thou hearest what God speaketh.

"Disciple: Is that where no creature dwelleth near at hand; or is it afar off?

"Master: It is in thee. And if thou canst, my son, for a while but cease from all thy thinking and willing, then thou shalt hear the unspeakable words of God.

"Disciple: How can I hear Him speak, when I stand still from thinking and willing?

"Master: When thou standest still from the thinking of self, and the willing of self; when both thy intellect and will are quiet, and passive to the impressions of the Eternal Word and Spirit; and when thy soul is winged up, and above that which is temporal, the outward senses, and the imagination being locked up by holy abstraction, then the eternal hearing, seeing, and speaking will be revealed in thee; and so God heareth and seeth through thee, being now the organ of *His* Spirit; and so God speaketh in thee, and whispereth to thy spirit, and thy spirit heareth His voice. Blessed art thou therefore if that thou canst stand still from self-thinking and self-willing, and canst stop the wheel of thy imagination and senses; forasmuch as hereby thou mayest arrive at length to see the great salvation of God, being made capable of all manner of divine sensations and heavenly communications. Since it is nought indeed but thine own hearing and willing that do hinder thee, so that thou dost not see and hear God."

The Master then points out the three requisites in more definite form: "The first is, Thou must resign up thy will to God; and must sink thyself down to the dust in His mercy. The second is, Thou must hate thy own will, and forbear from doing that to which thy own will doth drive thee. The third is, Thou must bow thy soul under the cross, heartily submitting thyself to it, that thou mayest be able to bear the temptations of nature and creature." [59]

Let us first consider this mysticism of Jacob Boehme and the other mystics from the psychological point of view, since many critics view the problems involved as chiefly psychological ones.

II

Some Psychological Aspects of the Mysticism of Jacob Boehme

Boehme wrote of the "Psychologia Vera" or "Vierzig Fragen von der Seele, ihrem Urstande, Essenz, Wesen, Natur und Eigenschaft, was sie von Ewigkeit in Ewigkeit sei."[1] Later he wrote an addition called the "Psychologial Supplementum". These titles show just what Boehme means by the term "psychologia" and since he uses it in the sense of soul, we must of course look for information concerning the psychological aspects of his mysticism in less direct sources. The previous chapter with its brief description of his mystical experiences will serve as a background for a psychological analysis of his mysticism as well as mysticism in general, for most psychologists group mystics together for the purpose of analysis of the phenomena involved.

There is no doubt in Boehme's mind as to the source of his experiences and as to what he experienced. God is both the object and the cause of his experiencing and illumination. The problem involved is reducible to terms of "God". But Boehme does not accept all such experiences without question and warns us constantly to watch for tricks of the devil. He tells us that man's whole race is a strife between the devil and the soul, the spirit of this world and the soul. Then when the sinner begins to be sensible of his evil and danger, the devil willingly permits him to go to the stone churches, then flatters him that his diligence in so doing makes him godly and devout.[2]

Boehme's experiences were intimate and real and even had he been familiar with modern psychological terminology, such terminology would probably have been inadequate to explain his very real inspiration and experience. He wrote to a friend of his experiences and inspired writing, "I might sometimes write more elegantly, and in a better style, but the fire burning within me is driving me on. My hand and my pen must then seek to follow the thoughts as well as they can. The inspiration comes like a shower of rain. That which I catch I have. If it were possible to

grasp and describe all that I perceive, then would my writings be more explicit."[3]

Boehme would likewise consider that real knowledge comes only from the awakening spirit and is not explainable in purely psychological terms. In one of his controversial and apologetic writings, he says, "I am not collecting my knowledge from letters and books, but I have it within my own self; because heaven and earth with all their inhabitants, and moreover, God Himself, is in man."[4]

In the same treatise he offers the same "psychological" explanation of his experience and knowledge in another form. ". . . For God hath given me the knowledge; it is not I myself that know it, but God knoweth it in me . . . Therefore now I submit and will know nothing, so far as I am self, viz; in that part from the outward world, that He may know in me what He will. I am not the genetrix in the knowing, but my spirit is His wife or woman in which He generateth the knowing, according to the measure how He will . . .

"As the eternal wisdom is the body of God so He generateth therein what He will. Then now if He generateth, it is not I that do it, but He in me. I am as dead in the generating of the knowledge and He is my life . . ."[5]

He again explains this "psychological" process and the foundation of our knowledge by pointing out that Christ says that the Son of Man does nothing except what he sees that the Father is doing. If the Son of Man has become our body and His spirit our own, shall we then not be able to know God? If we live in the Christ, the spirit of Christ will see through us and in us whatever it desires, and that which Christ desires we will see and know in Him. The world of the angels is easier and more clearly comprehensible to the regenerated man than the terrestrial world. He also sees into heaven, and beholds God and eternity.[6]

Of course, such an explanation is not acceptable to most psychologists. Many of the modern studies in mysticism consider the phenomena involved to be a problem in psychology rather than one in epistemology or metaphysics. The claims of the mystics are thus discounted and explained away. These studies made from the psychological point of view consider mysticism

merely as a phase of some psychological abnormality, and though these studies are no doubt helpful in many respects, they do not answer many of the questions to which such as Jacob Boehme earnestly desire an answer. They are taken from different angles and various conclusions have been reached by different psychologists, but we must remember that psychological analysis views the phenomena in question from but one aspect and still leaves ultimate questions unanswered, although clarifying intermediate problems. Some consider the pathological-morbid outward phenomena interchangeable with mysticism itself and even identify mysticism with magic, table-knocking, vision-seeing and what not. They explain the phenomena upon the basis of such things as "irruption of the sub-conscious", "auto-suggestion", "hysteria", "annihilation of the will", "hypertrophy of the attention", "eretheism of the imagination", "coming into control of lower centers", etc.

Nordau goes so far as to say that we see "in mysticism a principal character of degeneration . . . there is scarcely a trace of degeneration in which it does not appear." The mystic "imagines he divines unknown and inexplicable relations among phenomena."[7] Cutten, DeSanctis Kielholz and other psychologists likewise consider the whole subject from the pathological point of view. Leuba has probably made the best study from the psychological approach. He first examines the experiences of uncivilized men and their attitude toward revelations of the Divine and union with the Divine. The rites of uncivilized man, his dances, self-torture and weird music are apt to bring about a trance condition in which the savage thinks he has communion with his god or gods. These psychological experiences of the savage are interpreted by him according to the religious beliefs he had before the trance, that is, they are an elaboration of the "given".

Ecstasy-producing drugs are considered and compared. The delightful impressions of limitless power, and freedom, the altered self-feelings, the impression that the soul is liberated from the body, and the automatisms, including sensory hallucinations, gave to the early mystics and those of today their beliefs and convictions. "Now every one of these impressions and beliefs

can be satisfactorily explained as the result of psycho-physiological forces set in activity or inhibited by the drug."[8] That is, the experiences of mystics are frequently similar to those had by users of drugs.

The mystical ecstasies of the Yogin and of the Christian mystics have so much in common that one must begin to suspect that the particular religion of either makes no difference in spite of the emphatic statements of the devotees of each. Descriptions from either could be applied to the other with but slight changes. Furthermore, if we take the descriptions of non-religious ecstasies such as those of poets, of epileptics, of normal persons and compare them with those of the religious type we find the same fundamental characteristics. So we may conclude that there is no need for any differences between religious and non-religious ecstasies. Such differences as there happen to be are "due to a different interpretation—the interpretation being itself the cause of important effective and volitional phenomena."[9]

The impression of ineffability and of illumination are largely responsible for the belief in the divineness of ecstasy. But here again psychology points out that these traits are common to trance conditions. Ether, nitrous oxide, and other drugs will produce similar conditions. While almost asleep these feelings come to some, in fact, "any narrowing of consciousness or any dissociation of mental connections, whatever the cause, may be accompanied by the strange impressions."[10]

Even granting for a moment the "uniqueness" of the claims of the mystics "for the sake of argument," Leuba feels that we cannot help but see that their "God" is an elaboration of the "given," even as the god and gods of the savage. They pass from sensations and feelings to a "God" made up of previous ideas of God and this God is automatically assigned as the cause. This cause-assigning habit is a very human one. "To think of God—any kind of god—however unusual in intensity or quality, is to ascribe a cause to an intuitive, immediate experience."[11] The savage hears the thunder and thinks it the voice of god—the mystic does the same when he says he feels God in an influx "of moral energy" while either in ecstasy or ordinary prayer.

We should "recall that religion and the enhancement of life

are inseparably associated. The substance of religious life is frequently described as communion or union with the Source of Life. Christ came that men might have eternal life. A professor of Christian theology describes the action of God as creating within the soul a new centre of activity and of force, introducing peace, joy, freedom, love, and light."[12] Many instances from the lives of the mystics and others could be cited to show the effect of prayer on believers in all religions. States of depression may thus be overcome and help given in battle. Such prayers are life-enhancing experiences and the believers feel that God does really communicate with them. Religious worship is essentially "a method of securing more and better life. It is because of similar effects, in part real and in part illusory, that the intoxication ceremonies we have passed in review are regarded by the non-civilized as uniting man to the Divine."[13]

The mystical and ecstatic trance brings to the believers various "incomparable sensuous delights," hallucinations, an impression of "limitless power and freedom," and a feeling of peace and relaxation. They explain them as a result of union with the Divine while the psychologists consider these things to be the result of illusions, as products of the experiencer's own mind.

Evelyn Underhill considers that the "history of mysticism demonstrates plainly enough that there is developed in some men another kind of consciousness, another "sense" beyond the normal qualities of the self."[14] But such an elaborate or unusual explanation according to psychology is not necessary. The ordinary psychological terms are enough to explain the phenomena, so we have been told. That these terms are sufficient is also the view of C. H. Hamilton. The psychological viewpoint from which his interpretation of mysticism is undertaken is "the functional one, the essential idea of which is that all mental processes are means by which the organism interacts with its environment in a way to further the total ongoing of life both individual and social."[15] This point of view should not rob us of our reverence of this "time-honored" phase of human conduct, but should increase our "admiration of the universe as a whole."

In answer to the objections of the mystics that mere students of mysticism can never really understand the subject, and that

only actual experience will enlighten one, Hamilton points out that one cannot write best or consider things in the midst of such emotions as anger and love, and that the same is true of such an emotional experience as mysticism. The experiencer *should* be cool and critical in order to properly evaluate his experience, and this of course cannot be done by the mystic. Likewise the so-called "mere student of mysticism" has many cases to study and does not rely on his own individual experience.

However, we may question all this. It is not necessary for the mystic to analyze his experience while in the mystical ecstasy. The mystical experiences of such as Jacob Boehme have made such a profound impression upon the experiencers that they were "ever after changed men." As Boehme himself tells us, he saw the essence and inner meaning of things. He likewise has answered the identical objection in many of his writings. In discussing the mystic's perception and presentation of Divine truth he points out that spiritual truths can best be presented by allegories and by such means men may be induced to think exalted thoughts. Exalted thoughts will then make possible a higher state of perception and spiritual truths will be perceived which are above mere intellectual reasoning. ". . . For the mind of man seeks after its native country again, out of which it has wandered, and would return again home to the eternal rest . . . If you be born of God, then it may well be apprehended by you, but the unenlightened mind cannot hit the mark. For if the mind desireth to see what is in a house, it must then be within that house; for from hearsay, without seeing it oneself, there is always doubting whether a thing be as is related. But that which is seen by the eye and understood by the heart carries conviction with it."[16]

And again we are told that the commentaries that are put upon Moses from reason will not show you Paradise, much less the Creator. The prophets and apostles learned more in the paradisiacal school in one hour, than the Doctors in their Universities in thirty years. One's own wisdom avails nothing, God gives it to him whom He loves, for nothing. It cannot be bought for money nor favour, as King Solomon will tell you.[17]

But here again we hardly expect the psychologists to agree

with Boehme and we at times find them considering mysticism "as a mode of adjustment and reaction under the stimulus of varying kinds of social environment." For example, Hamilton does this and as the carrying categories of the discussion he uses:

(a) Human instincts
(b) Sensitivity of temperament
(c) Social environment

A careful analysis of the works and lives of mystics will, he says, enable one to reduce their experiences to these three categories. The human instincts have remained the same for the mystics of all ages, coupled with the required sensitivity of temperament. With these requirements a mystic, a poet or an artist might easily be produced, depending on individual environment. The different social environment of different ages results in differences likewise in the types of mystics produced in different ages. This is brought out clearly by Hamilton by means of a comparative study of Neo-Platonic mysticism, St. Teresa and Pascal. Each was an exemplification of the highest ideals and social values of their times. Variations in each are traced to the social environment of the age and similarities in individual environment.

He makes use of the analysis of hypnosis by Boris Sidis in "Psychology of Suggestion". The conditions of hypnosis are: (1) Fixation of attention; (2) Monotony; (3) Limitation of voluntary movements; (4) Inhibition; (5) Limitation of the field of consciousness.

Here again, the experiences of the mystics may be analyzed on exactly the same basis. No "special senses" are needed to explain mysticism, no divine intervention, just the same things that affect our actions from day to day in other matters as well. As a result of his psychological study and attempted simplification of mystical experience, Hamilton concludes:

"1. In the first place we are led to feel that we may not look to mysticism for the sure revelation of the transcendent world which the historical mystics have always claimed as a definite attainment. Since their comprehension of value is always re-

ceived from the social consciousness of their time they cannot give us any better statement in cognitive terms of that value than some clear-minded thinker might give us who was not noted for any mystical experience.

"2. Secondly, we see that the point of marvel in mystical experience is not the place where the mystic thought it was . . . We wonder and are impressed at the intricate interaction of environment and temperament and instinct . . . they will not destroy the sense of mystery of existence, but lay for it a far broader, deeper foundation."[18]

Delacroix considers mysticism as largely a problem in psychology and denies any transcendental value to mystical revelation. He attributes it exclusively to the normal content of the subliminal mind.[19] For example, he makes a very careful and sympathetic analysis of St. Teresa and concludes that what she claimed to be a progress toward the absolute and a uniting with God was merely a uniting with the contents of her own subconscious mind. Evelyn Underhill defends the seeming weaknesses and pathological disturbances evident in St. Teresa and numerous other mystics by reminding us that "If we see in the mystics, as some have done, the sporadic beginning of a power, a higher consciousness, towards which the race slowly tends; then it seems likely enough that where it appears nerves and organs should suffer under a stress to which they have not yet become adapted and that a spirit more highly organized than its bodily home should be able to impose strange conditions on the flesh." Their bodies are not yet adapted to such feelings.

Coe admits that mystical revelation can of course be traced down to the formal physiological and psychological conditions of the mystic himself, but warns against any misconstruing of this fact. "The point is not that the mystic revelation has a psychological basis; even if there were a direct intuition of God, it would doubtless have a law-abiding correlation with brain-processes. What discredits the mystic's theory is that it accepts as immediate intuition what is palpably an interpretation. His spiritual monism may be true or not; that question does not here concern us; the present contention is simply that the mystic acquires his religious convictions precisely as his non-mystical

neighbor does, namely, through tradition and instruction, auto-suggestion grown habitual, and reflective analysis. The mystic brings his theological beliefs to the mystical experience; he does not derive them from it." He likewise considers the recurrent spontaneous obsessions of "cosmic consciousness" so common to mystical experience to be due to the fact that these mystic confessions come from a "homogeneous group of minds whose suggestibility is sufficient to give to *ideas* the force of present experience or intuition."[20] The experience in the trance or revelation provide the material for the particular mystical interpretation. The mystics would like to regard interpretations of experience as actual experience.

Hocking also considers the mystic experience as law-abiding. It is not supernatural but comes within the range of law "and probably also within some law of *rhythm.* That is, the mystic's elevation is transient presumably because it is a phase in some natural rise and fall, some organic wave perhaps, in experience. If so, this transiency, external character though it is, will offer the most favorable angle for scientific approach. For any rhythmic movement in experience reveals not only an organic bond, but a law of connection as well, through which the special phase in question is bound in with the before and the afterward, and begins to be interpreted."[21] On the other hand, Delacroix likes to consider whatever rhythm there is as something to be overcome; and this rhythm is overcome in the long experience of the greater mystics according to him. These differences in explanation are quite common in the analyses made by the psychologists. We are reminded that when we ask the mystic what he is seeking he replies, "God". "The behaviour of the mystics, like that of everybody else, is instigated by innate tendencies to action and by needs that express themselves in forms determined mainly by experience. The tendencies and needs that come to expression with especial intensity in our group of mystics may be listed as follows:

1. The tendencies to self-affirmation and the need for self-esteem.
2. The tendencies to cherish, to devote oneself to something or

somebody. These tendencies come to their most perfect expression in the parents' relations with the utterly dependent child, but strange as it may seem, they appear even in man's relations with God.

3. The needs for affection and moral support.

4. The need for peace, for single-mindedness or unity, both in passivity and in action.

5. "Organic" needs or needs for sensuous satisfaction (especially in connection with the sex-life). . . ."[22]

Although these and many other psychologists take this general attitude, I feel that the objections are rather numerous if we carefully consider the matter. In the first place, do we really explain anything by looking wise and referring it to the sub-conscious region as some do? Blaming the sub-conscious for that of which we are ignorant or explaining things upon that basis is a poor explanation indeed, for the sub-conscious region itself needs explanation and is not in a position to give illumination.

Likewise there is an objection to this point of view on the grounds that the pathological accompaniments of mysticism are accidental, or incidental. The accompaniments are not mysticism itself! In attempting to explain mysticism by this method too much extraneous matter is brought in—the field is too wide. These things should of course be noted and studied, but they must be evaluated and seen in their true relations and proportions. "The Mystics of all ages, whose intuition and inner perceptions point rather to a real form of human experience than to any pathological states of mind, have in a similar way felt and experienced God rather than thought about him, and felt him as life or love or infinitude."[23]

Evelyn Underhill likewise feels that the pathological disturbances common to mystics do not disprove the validity of their claims. Artists and others have had similar maladjustments, but their art is beautiful just the same. Psycho-physical relations are but little understood and bodies being made for animal activities, unusual use of nerve cells results in a penalty. The mystics have frequently been criticized for their use of sex symbols and language apparently bordering on love and marriage

at low levels in a seeming sacriligious connection. "The great saints who adopted and elaborated this symbolism, applying it to their pure and ardent passion for the Absolute were destitute of the prurient imagination which their modern commentators too often possess. They were essentially pure of heart; and when they 'saw God' they were so far from confusing that unearthly vision with the products of morbid sexuality, that the dangerous nature of the imagery which they employed did not occur to them. They knew by experience the unique nature of spiritual love: and no one can know anything about it in any other way."[24]

One reviewer criticizes Leuba's book on mysticism on the grounds that it "claims to deal with religious Mysticism; but in facts it deals chiefly with five religious mystics, four of whom are women, and at least three definitely pathological. It is surely a pity to study so vast a subject—so wide in its range and so rich in its varieties—on the basis of such slender evidence. What of the massive strength and sanity of Augustine, Gregory, Bernard and the rest? But, starting from the idea that Mysticism—in spite of his own wider definition—reaches its climax in religious ecstasy, the author has little ado to prove his point. An ecstasy closely akin to religious fervour can be induced, no doubt, by drugs and alcohol . . . And the special form and contents of the visions attained by St. Theresa and Madame Guyon can be seen by the naked eye of the psychologist to be due to disorders in their psychic life—conflicts, sex-compensations, and all the rest of it. But it is equally true that the form in which the philosopher conceives the Timeless Absolute, or the mathematician the ideal triangle, and indeed the psycho-analyst the complex, are conditioned by their own unconscious processes. That does not prove that the triangle is not there: nor does the psychologist ever doubt the complex. We may grant that these women were 'morbid' in some direction; we may feel that St. Catharine of Genoa would have been a good deal less unbearable, to herself and her disciples, if she could have consulted Dr. Hadfield; we need not deny that some of these 'experiences' were wrongly coloured and perverted by the psychological mechanism involved. But does that prove that the object of the experience—even if partially misapprehended—was no true Reality at all?"[25] This is a question which psychologists cannot answer.

These symptoms of nervous disorders over which psychologists gloat are not indicative of any moral worthlessness. The "facts" used to support their theories are generally carefully picked and fail to take the life as a whole into consideration. The mystics such as Jacob Boehme refused to compromise with ethics and carried out logically the ideals of their Church. These differed from ordinary Christians in that they were more radical and were not satisfied with any partial measures. The ordinary psychopath seeks the easiest way out of difficult social relations, while the mystic seeks for the highest good known to him, regardless of consequences. Probably the mystics have failed more than others in many instances, because they have tried more.

The explanations offered by the psycho-analysts are at times especially amusing in as much as they force their theory into every case. The visions of the Virgin Mary had by monks are the means by which these celibates expressed their libido. On the other hand, they tell us, the nuns in the convents expressed their libido through visions of Christ or one of the male saints. We would think these psycho-analysts hard pressed while considering Boehme in as much as he was a married man with a family, and besides, a Lutheran is not likely to have any mystical visions of the Virgin Mary. However, we are told by Sante De Sanctis that "Mystic-erotic aberrations have been found also among the great mystics of history. In Jacob Boehme, for example, we find the identification with Christ, which, in the sense we have already explained, is common to all mystics; but he had also a strange conception of Lucifer and Adam, which had a basis in homosexual and hermaphroditic tendencies, with numerous paranoidal symptoms."[26]

Kielholz develops this idea in great detail and seeks to explain the steps by means of which Boehme became a mystic theosophist writer after starting as a humble shoemaker. He is certain that sexuality influenced the entire system of Boehme and arrives at the same conclusion just mentioned in the previous paragraph.[27]

G. B. Cutten considers that this element of sexuality was latent in Boehme's writings but that he was able to work it off in fantasy. In many other cases involving the same religious beliefs and attitudes this latent element expressed itself in actual license in one

form or another.[28] Pfister hints at his opinion of Jacob Boehme's more personal aspects, but simply says, "I should like to show you how far Julius (one of his psychopathic patients) was akin to Plato, Jacob Boehme, Spinoza, Kant, Fichte and other thinkers under the influence of repression. But I should have to draw too much material from other psychoanalytical observations, and overstep the limits of prescribed by this chapter."[29] This forcing of a psycho-analytic interpretation into every conceivable condition causes it to lose its value. According to these, if the mystics express themselves in one way, the explanation is sexual; if they don't thus express themselves, then the explanation is homosexuality and repression!

Evelyn Underhill likewise has many objections to the entire "rationalistic" or so-called "scientific" scheme of explaining mystical phenomena and writes that "we have the strangely named rationalists, who feel that they have settled the matter once for all by calling attention to the undoubted parallels which exist between the bodily symptoms of acute spiritual stress and the bodily symptoms of certain forms of disease. The considerations, reinforced by those comfortable words 'auto-suggestion' and 'psychosensorial hallucination' which do but reintroduce mystery in another and less attractive form . . . enable them to pity rather than blame the peculiarities of the great contemplatives."[30]

Rufus M. Jones would answer the psychologists by calling attention to the value of first hand experience in religion. If the mystic's system were to be judged by its fruits, no group of mystics would be a better argument for it than the Quakers. Their history has been a sane and sensible one, free from extremes and abnormalities—no "hysterical" saints, but just some of the most substantial and desirable citizens in their respective communities. This writer says of the experiences of the mystics: "Are these unusual and more or less abnormal experiences instances of pathology, cases of hysteria, or are they evidence of Divine Influence and Divine Presence? The mystic himself believes that he has an *experience of God* because (1) these experiences of his come from beyond the margin of his individual me; (2) there is something in the content of his experience which

transcends anything that normally belongs to him in his finiteness; and (3) these experiences possess an impelling, coercive power, a higher unification of life than he ordinarily knows." [31]

Jones does admit that this may largely be the result of suggestion. People who are hypersensitive to suggestion and given much to introspection might easily be swayed by things heard or seen. Abnormal living will cause abnormal states of mind in which these visions and the like may occur. Hypnotic suggestion will enable us to produce the state almost at will.

"We cannot, therefore, with implicit confidence, leap to the conclusion that every instance of so-called mystical experience furnishes us with a sure clue to the God whom our eager souls seek. To the mystic himself the experience is evidence enough. It lights his lamp and guides him; it girds his loins for action; it floods him with new power; it banishes doubt and despair as the sunrise banishes darkness. He no more wants arguments now to prove God's existence than the artist wants arguments to prove the reality of beauty or the lover does to prove the worth of love. . . . . But while these inward mystical experiences cannot be pushed to the extreme of being turned into compelling ontological proofs, they nevertheless do offer a very weighty ground for believing that there is a More of Consciousness continuous with our own—a co-consciousness with which our own is bound up, and that constructive influences do come into us from beyond ourselves." [32]

We must not be afraid of the *words* that psychologists use to explain the phenomena. The fact remains that *energy to live by actually does come to the mystics from somehere.* To say that it is a result of suggestion or an elaboration of the given is to say something that can be said about everything else. Our morals, our language, our fashions are all results of group-suggestion. Even the results of our reasoning processes are likely to be in accord with our preconceived ideas, unless we are unusually honest and careful. "And auto-suggestion may be only another way of saying that God and man are conjunct, and that in the deeps of the soul, beyond our power of knowing how, Divine suggestions come to human consciousness." [33]

In a later work Jones seems to have Leuba's book on mysticism

especially in mind and continues his criticism of the method of approach and conclusions of the psychologists in the field of mysticism. He states that in "so far as the mystical experience is taken as a sheer, bare experience, sacred in its own right, uninterpreted, and unrelated to moral and spiritual effects on life and character, the criticism carries weight. It is obvious that 'mere feels', 'ineffable exaltations', 'unspeakable heavenly uplifts', which remain uncorrelated with the total whole of life and thought, so long as they are *that* and nothing more, give no clue to objective value, or to objective reality . . . The same psychological method applied to any form of sense experience in the same limited way would equally deprive it of objective reality . . . The method of psychological diagnosis which is believed to destroy all objective validity of mystical experience would also destroy all objective validity in every field of experience."[34]

In other words, although we owe a great debt to the psychologists for their careful work and analysis, yet they must not try to go beyond their own field. They should not deal with ultimate questions. The mere observation of facts, mental processes, mental reactions and mental phenomena does not provide us with a criterion of objectivity. This is merely the way in which the psychologists view things and they are not to be blamed if they tend toward the reduction of religion to a subjective basis. No one would desire less than Jones to have the field of psychology unduly circumscribed, but he does wish to emphasize the fact that psychology as a science does not invade the realm of philosophical interpretation—a point which psychologists themselves have affirmed.

The psychology of religion cannot give a sure ground for the objective realities which are so essential to such a profoundly religious soul as Jacob Boehme. Too often the material presented in such psychological studies, as mentioned before, is too selective in character, but one such study ends with the very striking statement, "We cannot close, however, without reminding the reader again that we have wandered through religious deserts, swamps, and marshes, through the wards of religious hospitals, and insane asylums, so to speak, where we saw the varieties of religious diseases. Our task did not take us out into

the busy world, into happy homes and beautiful houses of worship where the uplighting influence of normal religion is abundantly in evidence. We have catalogued and studied the poisonous weeds; the many beautiful and fragrant flowers and fruits need no searching out."[35]

Boehme and the Quakers would be examples of the latter for here we find wonderful exemplification of mysticism in healthy, normal lives. Spiritual values for such as these have a peculiar significance and some philosophers "find solid ground for the position that the central values of human life carry objective reference, at least as certainly as do our perceptions of external objects. In any case the person who at the present stage of his philosophical quest insists upon sheer subjectivity is, to say the least, premature, superficial, and dogmatic. One of the best ways to make a contribution toward a final settlement of these issues is to clarify still further the real nature of Mystical experience and to link it up with the social, the ethical, and the practical aspects of life."[36]

We should not consider the mystic as a peculiar individual—one who by some lucky chance has received Divine recognition. He is really one who has given more thought and time to things of a nature pertaining to "God" and pertaining to their relation to it or him. He has built up his soul in a moral and spiritual way just as the artist or musician builds his in an artistic manner. The mystic receives things through "intuition" just as thoughts and ideas pour into some artists and writers—"little invisible jinnees"—such as brought ideas to Robert Louis Stevenson.

But what proof do we have of their objective Reality? Should we not also ask what proof do we have of the real nature of our most ordinary experiences? Do we see things of sense as they "really" are, do all see things the same, do we see differently from time to time? Common sense of course enables us to keep a straight path in the performance of our daily duties, although the questions still remain in our mind. No doubt, however, in the world of values, things vary more. My appreciation of art, poetry, mysticism and music differs more from that of others than would my sense perceptions. My sense of duty and moral responsibility would likewise have more of my personal outlook

than my mere judgment concerning things of the sense. "And yet the noblest minds have always refused to admit that beauty or obligation are out and out, through and through, subjective. These experiences in some sense have their ground in the eternal nature of things, and they conform, in inner law . . . . to some over-arching reality beyond us, but not alien to our finite minds. It seems evident that moral practice slowly builds up a richer, deeper inner life within us and reveals a cumulative power of moral advance which indicates that something in the deepest nature of the universe backs a person who is making his life an organ of ethical goodness."[37]

The mystic has a majestic conviction of objectivity. He is certain he has reached the peak and the view for him is convincing. Jones is forced to admit, however, that the usual means of verifications of the sense facts are wanting. Ordinary speech is inadequate and corroborative testimony is of course not obtained. Does this damaging admission end the debate? He thinks not, for ". . . here once more, as with aesthetic and ethical experience, there comes a slow but very convincing type of verification. The life of the person takes on new depth. There is a marked increase in unity and coherence to the personality . . . The whole spiritual nature is fructified . . . A typical fortification of character is wrought in him . . . The Soul as William James would say, is made 'more energetic' . . . There is something more to it than a subjective feel."[38]

In other words, the mystical experiences of such as Boehme constitute an *integrating* or unifying factor, while the experiences of the "hystericals" selected by the psychologists constitute *disintegrating* factors. The truly mystical is that which unifies and expands the whole man—the entire personality. It also enables the experiencer to do, live, feel and act more than he himself can explain or account for, but what is more important for us just at present, the mystic can do, live, feel and act more than the psychologists can explain or account for. So our reply to the psychologists is that they take but a partial view of selected phenomena and consequently we refer them to a pragmatic consideration of the mystics themselves. In the next chapter we shall consider the pragmatic implications of the mysticism of Jacob Boehme.

III

Some Pragmatic Aspects of the Mysticism of Jacob Boehme

We have seen that the reaction and defense against the psychological approach to mysticism lead to a pragmatic and ethical treatment of mysticism. The psychologists in their *proper* sphere treat the phenomena in question in a way which does not strictly concern us. Mysticism, in its metaphysical and epistemological aspects, considers the phenomena from a different angle. Let us consider the mystic from the point of view of the pragmatist, using the term at first rather broadly and then in its narrower philosophical sense.

Now there are two interpretations of mysticism as has been already noted. Some consider it abnormal and psychopathic, while others consider the real mystic as a "person who, by conformity to the goal of life revealed in Christ, has realized his life upward in full unison with God—a way of living which is as normal as healthy breathing."[1] Some consider only the abnormal type, but "there is no more reason for narrowing the word 'mysticism' to cover this type alone than there is for using the word 'love' for pathological love alone."[2]

Other phases of human experience have their exaggerated aspects, but it is not necessary to reject the normal on that account. The mystics have had a definite aim and a definite quest and this quest "has constituted the whole meaning of life: they have made for it without effort sacrifices which have appeared enormous to other men: and it is an indirect testimony to its objective actuality, that whatever the place or period in which they have arisen, their aims, doctrines and methods have been substantially the same. Their experience, therefore, forms a body of evidence, curiously self-consistent and often mutually explanatory, which must be taken into account before we can add up the sum of the energies and potentialities of the human spirit, or reasonably speculate on its relations to the unknown world which lies outside the boundaries of sense."[3]

We are reminded by Inge that a "speculative religious system

is best known by its fruits."[4] Nearly all writers on mysticism make much of this point. They call attention to the lives of the mystics, to the sacrifices they made, to their many efforts, to their zeal, and unselfishness. From this whole-hearted interest and increased power, considered due to the mystical revelations, they argue for the objective reality of mysticism.

In a magazine article, Masson points out the tendency revealed in recent books to find a harmony between science and mysticism, and to discover a practical method for higher living. Upon the basis of modern works on the problem of mysticism this seems possible and could be considered as a part of racial improvement.[5] In another article Engelbrecht questions whether intelligence is enough to solve social ills. He suggests mysticism guided by intelligence as the solution to the problem. If this were practical and feasible, then mysticism would find a pragmatic foundation, but we find another side to the problem.[6] Although it is well for us to be reminded of the value of occasional solitude and contemplation as aids to happier living and as aids to intelligence, mysticism, according to many, tends to be desocializing. We are told that it calls the individual away from the world and focuses his thoughts upon himself. Even when not pathological it is exclusively for self. A faith is needed that will not unbalance one, which does not destroy personality, but develops it and enlarges its scope. A faith is needed which when combined with reason, will equip one to go forth into the world of action.[7] There seems to be too much of a "Me and God" attitude on the part of some mystics and for that reason many have denied that mysticism has any very great moral value or pragmatic significance. This desocializing effect has been denied by others as mentioned in a previous chapter, and the first step for the mystic should be a desire to help and serve others.

Are these objections applicable to Jacob Boehme? Is his mysticism exclusively for self? We have already seen that this is not so. His is an integrating faith which does not unbalance or destroy personality, in spite of the fact that Bishop Warburton considered that Boehme's works would disgrace Bedlam at full moon and John Wesley considered his works as sublime nonsense, inimitable bombast, fustian not to be paral-

leled. Neither probably knew very much about Boehme. A much wiser individual was Sir Isaac Newton who lived in seclusion for three months in order to study the writings of Boehme dealing with attraction and the laws of motion. Let us see for ourselves what verification of the truth of Boehme's mystical experiences we can find or at least what verification he claims.

"Now the Scripture witnesses throughout, and the new-born man finds it so, that when the soul is new-born in the light of God, then on the contrary it finds how very humble, meek, courteous, and cheerful it is; it readily bears all manner of crosses and persecution; it turns the body from out of the way of the wicked; it regards no reproach, disgrace, or scorn, put upon it from the devil or man; it places its confidence, refuge, and love in the heart of God; it is very cheerful; it is fed by the Word of God, in which there is a paradisiacal exulting and triumph; it cannot be hurt, or so much as touched by the Devil."[8] This is largely autobiographic in character for after the appearance of his first writings he was savagedly attacked by the pastor of Goerlitz, Gregorius Richter. Boehme was unjustly expelled from his native town without even being permitted to bid his family good-bye. He was denounced from the pulpit in his own hearing; scurrilous tracts filled with personal abuse and ignoble sneers were written against him, but his answers were all gentle and dignified. Gregorius Richter, the representative of the Son of the carpenter, seemed to base most of his objections to Boehme on the fact that he was a shoemaker and smelled overmuch of cobbler's pitch.

We again see Boehme's helpful and kindly attitude when he tells us to love and help all. "Withdraw your love from none, for your God, in whom you live, withdraweth Himself from none that seek Him." Again he says that Christ teacheth us humility, love, pureness of heart, and to be merciful; and calleth upon us to seek after the will of God, and to submit ourselves to it: for in God's will we are able to do *all*; our own nature must not do it; but God Himself is zealous in us, and He is our doing if we work any wonder.[9] There is no doubt in Boehme's mind as to the source of his strength and guidance, nor is his yielding to the will of God unfruitful of pragmatic results, because a larger

liberty of soul and spirit appears to result from this yielding. Before there is a false liberty, but the true freedom is in God through Christ.[10]

Furthermore, by this understanding or coming into contact with God we are enabled to understand "The Signature of All Things." To know God is to know all things and to see into the essence of matter. This increased understanding of the inner nature of things has again great pragmatic value and leads to a larger and fuller life. Of course, we must keep in mind the fact that all these valued results were secondary in the mind of Boehme. The most important thing in his mind was eternal salvation, and granting the truth of the Christian teachings, this is the greatest pragmatic result conceivable. But questions of ultimate rewards had best be eliminated from any pragmatic consideration of mysticism.

Boehme places great stress upon the joy, happiness and liberty of spirit brought about through an intimate experiencing of God. This is spoken of as the "pearl" of great price. "No money, nor goods, nor art, nor power, can bring you to the eternal rest of the eternal soft meekness of Paradise, but only the noble knowledge. Into that you may wrap up your Soul. That is the Pearl which no moth can eat, nor thief can steal away; therefore seek after it, and then you will find the noble Treasure."[11] Again he writes of the "Pearl," that is, the high and deep wisdom of God, "There seek for the noble Pearl; it is much more precious than this whole world; it will never more depart from you, and where the Pearl is, there will your heart be also. You need not ask any further after Paradise, joy, and the heavenly delightfulness. Seek but the Pearl and when you find that, then you find Paradise and the Kingdom of Heaven, and you will be so taught as being without it you cannot believe.

"It may be, you will trouble yourself with hard labour and seek for it in art, supposing to find it there. Oh no, you need not! It lies not therein."[12]

Boehme's mysticism "works," to borrow a term from William James, whom we shall discuss presently: it works in respect to such values as joy, happiness, peace and a deeper understanding of life. Boehme writes constantly of the joy of this divine life[13]

and tells us what we must choose in order to obtain this lasting real joy.[14] He tells us constantly that the soul that fears God is full of joy and happiness. Contact with God and experiencing of God deepened life and its meaning for him, while things of this world and the riches thereof were considered transitory when compared with eternal riches. Again we are told that the riches of this world are but dross and dung.[15] These are the pragmatic values emphasized by Boehme and additional ones will be mentioned in the next chapter in connection with the ethical philosophy in his mystical system. There we shall see additional evidence of the fact that Boehme firmly believed that his mysticism *worked* in relation to the "higher" values of life. What does not work cannot be true, but we have no desire to insist too strongly upon the reverse. We view pragmatism chiefly of value as a supplementary method of verification and a valuable method, too.

When we turn to William James, the leading exponent of pragmatism, we find this statement: "Mystical states, when well developed, usually are, and have the right to be, absolutely authoritative over the individual to whom they come. No authority emanates from them which should make it a duty for those who stand outside of them to accept their revelations uncritically. They break down the authority of the non-mystical or rationalistic consciousness, based upon the understanding and the senses alone . . . They open out the possibility of other orders of truth, in which, so far as anything in us vitally responds to them, we may freely continue to have faith."[16]

Even though the senses are held in abeyance during the mystic's experience, such experience is a direct perception of fact just as much as any sensation ever is and for that reason James considers the mystic's revelation to be invulnerable. The knowledge of the mystic is intuitive and immediate, hence unassailable. It is *given* and so is not subject to the errors that knowledge would be that is obtained through mental operations. It would be well to keep in mind that James is especially interested and sympathetic with mystical thinking of the healthy minded type; the happy type of mystic rather than the gloomy introvert. Boehme, as we have seen, is of the healthy, happy type, although not mentioned by James.

James tells us that "the truest scientific hypothesis is that which, as we say, 'works' best; and it can be no otherwise with religious hypotheses."[17] How can we apply this to the experience of the mystics such as Jacob Boehme? "Works best" in respect to what? Does such experience produce greater amounts of happiness than other experiences? Does it give a greater capacity for work? If such be the case, then the hypothesis put forth by the mystic must be the truest scientific hypothesis according to this criterion. But suppose such experience "works best" in respect to the production of insanity or the lifting of the experiencer into a realm of dreams whereby he is made unfit for the common duties and responsibilities! Both views of mystical experience have been taken depending on which particular mystics are being considered. However, in the case of Boehme, it is safe to conclude that his experiences vastly increased his happiness and in no direct way interferred with his humble daily tasks. His many writings likewise speak well for his industry and capacity for work. Hence, for Boehme, according to James' hypothesis, this experience must constitute truth.

James further tells us that in the struggle of religious ideas, those things remaining or able to survive are worthy of consideration. James would defend the right of the mystic to adopt a believing attitude in regard to his alleged religious experiences in spite of merely logical objections. The deadness and aliveness of any hypothesis regarding mystical experiences are not to be regarded as intrinsic properties, but relations to the individual thinker or mystic. Of course, even in judging of such matters we must be on our guard, for minds play tricks on us and "as a rule we disbelieve all facts and theories for which we have no use."

But the faith of the mystic, of the religious believer, is a thing to be reckoned with according to James. Faith in a fact can help create a fact. An army, a commercial system, a team, a college, all exist and act upon the strength of the belief that others in the group will likewise do their part—this mutual faith makes the fact possible.[18] The mystic cannot escape the issue by merely remaining sceptical about his experience and waiting for more light, because although he thereby may avoid an error of judgment if his experience is not a truly religious one, yet certainly he

would lose the good, if it be a true one. So from the point of view of pragmatism one would be better off in accepting such affirmations of mystical experience even though in error.

In our everyday life we must meet our fellow men halfway and give them some faith or cut ourselves off from social benefits. So likewise if the seeker after truth "shuts himself up in snarling logicality and tries to make the gods extort his recognition willy-nilly or not get it at all, (he) might cut himself off forever from his only opportunity of making the god's acquaintance."[19]

The experiences of such mystics as Jacob Boehme have given them the courage to meet life's difficulties and in many cases meet martyrdom with a smile of faith. William James points out that "it is a fact of human nature that men can live and die by the help of a sort of faith that goes without a single dogma or definition. The bare assurance that this natural order is not ultimate, but a mere sign or vision, the external staging of a many-storied universe in which spiritual forces have the last word and are eternal—this assurance is to such men enough to make life seem worth living in spite of every contrary presumption suggested by its circumstances on the natural plane."[20]

This is no doubt true, but it must not be forgotten that this bravery in the face of death is not a unique characteristic of the Christian mystic. Those of other religious faiths have reached a serene and tranquil place in the midst of trying circumstances. In so far as they all 'work' it would seem that pragmatism would have to admit them all as true!

The philosopher seeks a rational conception of things and recognizes it when found by certain subjective marks. According to William James these marks are "a strong feeling of ease, peace—the transition from a state of puzzle and perplexity to rational comprehension is full of lively relief and pleasure."[21] The mystic likewise seeks an explanation and at times seems to come near to it and to obtain a feeling of ease, peace—all things are plain in the ineffable light which seems to fill his whole being. The mystic reduces the manifold complexity of things to the One—to God.

"The facts of the world in their sensible diversity are always before us, but our theoretic need is that they should be conceived

in a way that reduces their manifoldness to simplicity . . . The simplified result (of thought) is handled with far less mental effort than the original data; and a philosophic conception of nature is thus in no metaphysical sense a labor-saving contrivance. The passion for parsimony, for economy of means in thought, is the philosophic passion par excellence."[22] But what if the philosopher has two conceptions equally fit to satisfy the logical demand? "Well, of two conceptions equally fit to satisfy the logical demand, that one which awakens the active impulses, or satisfies other aesthetic demands better than the other, will be accounted the more rational conception, and will deservedly prevail."[23]

A possible practical requisite which a philosophic conception must have is that it must satisfy, "it must in a general way at least banish uncertainty from the future." For the mystics all uncertainties are banished by his experience with God and certainly this practical requisite is met in Boehme's own mind at least. The mystic is undoubtedly strongly influenced by so-called subjective elements, but is the scientist or philosopher himself objectively minded in his searches—is he above personal preferences or trends? "It is almost incredible that men who are themselves working philosophers should pretend that any philosophy can be, or ever has been, constructed without the help of personal preference, belief, or divination. How have they succeeded in so stultifying their sense for the living facts of human nature as not to perceive that every philosopher, or man of science either, whose initiative counts for anything in the evolution of thought, has taken his stand on a sort of dumb conviction that the truth must lie in one direction rather than another, and a sort of preliminary assurance that his notion can be made to work; and has borne his best fruit in trying to make it work?"[24] ". . . I myself believe that all the magnificient achievements of mathematical and physical science—our doctrine of evolution, of uniformity of law, and the rest—proceed from our indomitable desire to cast the world into a more rational shape in our minds than the shape into which it is thrown there by the crude order of our experience. The world has shown itself, to a great extent, plastic to this demand of ours for rationality."[25]

The mystic has certain things presented to him—the data presented by his experience may provide the key which will unlock the mysteries after which he has been seeking. But some faith in his own experience is required and the proof will not exist until the mystic has acted in reliance upon his experience. William James further says that "the world may in fact be likened unto a lock whose inward nature, moral or immoral, will never reveal itself to our simply expectant gaze. The positivists, forbidding us to make any assumption regarding it, condemn us to eternal ignorance, for the evidence which they wait for can never come so long as we are passive. But nature has put into our hands two keys by which we may test the lock. If we try the moral key and it fits, it is a moral lock. If we try the unmoral key and it fits, it is an unmoral lock . . . The proof exists not till I have acted, and I must needs in acting run the risk of being wrong."[26] But there is one difference which must not be overlooked in our analysis of mysticism and the pragmatic philosophy. The mystic assumes a God all made up in advance—truth for him is an *absolute thing* toward which he the mystic moves, or toward which he is drawn. But we all contribute to truth and make truth rather than discover something up in the realm of the "Real". This is especially true as it concerns the intellectual and moral life of the race, for we all contribute to this and aid in the final statement of truth.

"We all help to determine the content of ethical philosophy so far as we contribute to the race's moral life. In other words there can be no final truth in ethics any more than in physics until the last man has had his experience and said his say. In the one case as in the other, however, the hypotheses which we now make while waiting, and the acts to which they prompt us are among the indispensable conditions which determine what the 'say' shall be."[27] In the realm of morals we find the hypothesis of the mystics as to the source of their experience well withstanding the pragmatic test, although they themselves do not consciously appeal to any philosophy which would tend to consider truth as a relative thing. Their 'God' is a stimulating ideal and in a merely human world without a God, the appeal to our moral energy falls short of its maximal stimulating power.

"When, however, we believe that a God is there, and that he is one of the claimants, the infinite perspective opens out. The scale of the symphony is incalculably prolonged. The more imperative ideals now begin to speak with an altogether new objectivity and significance, and to utter the penetrating, shattering, tragically challenging note of appeal . . . All thus through history, in the periodical conflicts of puritanism with the don't-care temper, we see the antagonism of the strenuous and genial moods, and the contrast between the ethics of infinite and mysterious obligation from on high, and those of prudence and the satisfaction of merely finite need."[28] The direct experience of the mystic with God provides a pretext for hard living and the strenuous character of the believing mystic will overcome the easy-going, even as religion will drive irreligion to the wall.

The ideas and experiences of Boehme are true, according to other criteria provided by James, to the extent that they enable him to get into satisfactory relations with other parts of his experience. It may seem strange to call an idea true so long as it is profitable to the life of the mystic, but James himself says: "I am well aware how odd it must seem to some of you to hear me say that an idea is 'true' so long as to believe it is profitable to our lives. That it is *good* for as much as it profits, you will gladly admit. . . . But is it not a strange misuse of the word 'truth' you will say, to call ideas also 'true' for this reason? . . . Let me now say only this, that truth is one species of good, and not, as is usually supposed, a category distinct from good, and co-ordinated with it. *The true is the name of whatever proves itself to be good in the way of belief, and good, too, for definite assignable reasons.*"[29]

So in judging the data of mysticism from the pragmatic point of view we have several questions to ask before deciding if true or false. If we grant the idea or belief of the mystic that he has received some revelation from Deity what actual difference will its being true make in the life of the mystic? How will the truth be realized and what experiences will be different from those which would obtain if the belief were false? In short what is the alleged truth's cash-value in experimental terms? We see that it is likely to be accepted as well as innumerable other ideas

and beliefs, but the negative aspect is unquestionable, namely, what does not work is not true.

James further mentions that true ideas are "those that we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify. False ideas are those that we cannot.... The truth of an idea is not a stagnant property inherent in it. Truth happens to an idea. It becomes true, is made true by events. Its verity is in fact an event, a process: the process namely of its verification. Its validity is the process of its valid-action.... 'The Truth', to put it very briefly, is only the expedient in the way of thinking, just as 'the right' is only the expedient in the way of our behaving."[30] Applying this to the mystical experience of Jacob Boehme, we can say that his ideas were true.[31] But a world in which a pragmatic philosophy is acceptible implies a world involving good and evil. A world of only good would be a world of only truth. How did this condition of good and evil come about? How did truth and falsehood likewise come to be. The next chapter will give Boehme's explanation of the existence of these opposites and how they originated.

IV

Ethical Philosophy in the Mysticism of Jacob Boehme

In the last chapter we saw that the mysticism of Jacob Boehme and others may be defended upon pragmatic grounds, but that a world in which a pragmatic philosophy is even discussed implies a world involving good and evil, since a world of only good would be a world in which evil and falsehood would be unknown. But the problem as to the existence of good and evil, truth and falsehood, has long been a vexing one for philosophy, and it is equally vexing for Jacob Boehme. We shall see as we study his explanation of good and evil that it is made up of Biblical explanations plus ideas from Schwenkfeld, Weigel and Paracelsus, a combination which is not likely to be always the simplest!

From the latter two he obtains the doctrine of the microcosm, namely, that we understand the secrets of external nature to the extent that God reveals to us the mysteries of our own being. In other words, all science and skills exist in man potentially and although we appear to learn by acquisition from without, we learn in reality through a revival and evolving of that which we have within us. Boehme thus views man as an epitome of creation, containing originally all things potentially.[1] To fully explain Boehme's position in this matter we must start at the beginning of things, the creation.

Boehme considers God as the supreme, eternal cause. He says that God is everything, that he is in heaven and earth, and also the external world, and such an assertion is true in a certain sense; because everything originates in and from God.[2] But we are not to understand this in any pantheistic sense for "the external world is not God, and will not be God in all eternity. The world is merely a state of existence wherein God is manifesting Himself."[3] "There will always a distinction have to be made between the Godhead and humanity, between the human will and the will of God."[4] God is not to be thought of as a blind power which exists beyond heaven having neither reason nor

knowledge, comparable to the sun, which runs around in its orbit, sending out light and heat regardless whether it benefits or harms the earth and her creatures. No! Not thus is the Father; but He is an omnipotent, all wise, and all-knowing God, in Himself good, kind, merciful, joyful, and even joy itself.[5] "The creation of the whole creation is nothing else but a manifestation of the all-essential, unsearchable God; all whatever He is in his eternal unbeginning generation and dominion, of that is also the creation, but not in the omnipotence and power, but like an apple which grows upon the tree, which is not the tree itself, but grows from the power of the tree: Even so all things are sprung forth out of the divine desire, and created into an essence, where in the beginning there was no such essence present, but only that same mystery of the eternal generation, in which there has been an eternal perfection."[6]

Now the usual philosophical methods will not do to make these fundamental propositions clear nor make us to understand just how God generates, creates or manifests Himself. A living method is necessary in order to penetrate into the mysteries of creation, so we must refer back to the principle of the microcosm mentioned previously. Being alone knows being, consequently in order to understand God, we must generate with God. The one who desires to know must place himself at the standpoint of God. Now man cannot ascend to God, but God can descend into man provided man dies to his corrupt, inborn nature and gives himself up to divine action. This conversion of the heart opens the eyes of the intelligence as other mystics have also insisted. The phenomenal world is but an imperfect manifestation of the noumenal world of divine perfection, but we must make use of it and study it even though its clumsy metaphors and images must be reinterpreted in the light of spirit and truth.

Boehme, like Eckhart and other mystics wants to know how a merely potential, motionless and inactive divinity, which is the first Being, becomes the living and personal God, who alone is true God. Now God wills to reveal Himself in all the fulness of His Being. How it came to happen that God stirred to produce creation, while He Himself is unchangeable, cannot be discovered, and an attempt to do so would merely produce a confusion of

mind.[7] We cannot tell how it happened that that which stood eternally in the essentiality of God entered into motion, because there is nothing that could have caused God to move, and the will of God is eternal and unchangeable. We can only say that the *Three* was desirous of having children of its own kind.[8] In other words, Boehme is ready to tell us "How" but not "Why".

Now this full revealing of Himself on the part of God requires the principle of opposition. Light is visible only when reflected by some dark body. In the same way anything whatsoever is posited or constituted only by being set over against its opposite. If it meets with no obstacle it will always go forward and never return into itself nor manifestly exist for itself or for another. If reality is to come from mere potency, it must result from an interaction with the negative principle, making this negative principle its instrument of expression. The eternal basis of our created nature is within God Himself constituted by the contrary essence or nature on which God relies for the purpose of personification of Himself. "In Ja und Nein bestehen alle Dinge". Night would be meaningless without day, heat would be meaningless without cold. Without struggle and opposition all would return to silence and immobility.[9]

We have here a Heraclitean state of affairs for Strife seems to be the father of all things. Evil seems to be necessary in order to manifest Good, but God has not on that account created anything Evil. Everything contains both elements; both angels and devils are in God, from God, live in God and move in God. The natural supposition and objection is that then both Good and Evil are in God or as one opponent in the time of Boehme remarked, "Thus is God at odds with Himself, being he is Evil and Good." To which Boehme replies in a rather annoyed manner, "Oh thou dear reason, learn the center here, or stay at home with thy teaching and writing: Behold! I tell thee this: If there were no anguish, there would be no fire; if there were no fire, there would be no light; if there were no light, there would be neither nature nor substance; and God would not be manifested to Himself. What now would there be then? A Nothing!"[10]

The problem of the reconciliation of these opposites of good and evil with the goodness of God is a very real problem with Boehme and he refers to it constantly. In his first apology to Balthazar Tylken he points out that, "The soul of man is from or out of that center which is called God the Father; understand, out of the eternal beginningless Nature. It hath the center, to the fire and light in itself, to evil and good. What it electeth or chooseth for itself, of *that* it is re-elected or choosen again and taken up, which is to be seen by the devils.

"They were angels in God's light and their center moved itself yet higher than the right of the angelic nature was and awakened in them the mother of the original in the fierce wrath. That also suddenly caught their will-spirit, and elected or choose them to be creatures of the dark world.

"Do you suppose now that it was God's predestinate purposed will to have it so? Then must God have a devil's will in himself, and also an angelical, which is quite contrary to the Holy Scripture, also against God's love and against the light of the eternal nature."[11]

And in *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens* he again discusses the troublesome question: ". . . Seeing He was omniscient therefore why did He let the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil grow?

"Reason judges thus, that if God would not have had it so, Adam should not have eaten it, or else He should not have forbidden that Tree only; surely He made it for a stumbling-stock to him. Thus the reason of one sort or party judges. The reason of the other party will mend the matter, which is indeed somewhat the wiser, but not much. They say, God tempted Adam to try whether he would continue in His obedience or not and when he became disobedient, then God threw mighty anger and wrath upon him and cursed him to death and that His wrath could not be quenched, except He be reconciled in such a manner. The reason of this party makes God to be a mere unmercifulness, like an evil man in this world, who yet will be reconciled when he has once revenged himself sufficiently. This reason has no knowledge at all of God, nor of Paradise.

"O beloved Soul! It is a very heavy business at which the

very heavens might well stand amazed. In this temptation there is a very great matter hidden in Moses which the unenlightened Soul understands not. God did not regard a bit of an apple or pear, to punish so fair a creature for it. The punishment comes not from His hand, but from the *Spiritus majoris mundi*, from the Spirit of the great world, from the third principle. God intended most mercifully towards man, and therefore He spared not His own Heart, but let it become man, that He might deliver man again. You ought not to have such thoughts. God is love, and the good in Him is no angry thought and man's punishment was not but from himself, as you shall read in its due place."[12]

Again Boehme insists that all of God's works are *good*. "Therefore now I direct the reader to the creatures that he may search into them, and so he shall find all things, and that more wonderfully than any man can write or speak, if we be born of God. We must not think with our understanding and skill of God's making or creating, as of a man that makes something, as a potter makes a vessel of a lump of clay or a stone-cutter or carver makes an image after his pleasure and if it does not please him, then he breaks it again. No, the works of God, in the creation of the world, were altogether fixt and stedfast, good and perfect, as Moses writes, 'and God saw all that He had made, and behold it was very good'."[13]

Boehme anticipates the objections which might be made as to his presumption in endeavoring thus to explain the creation and the opposites involved, but it is not strange for a man to write, speak, and teach of the creation of the world, though he was not present when it was doing, if he has but the knowledge in the Spirit. For there, Boehme says, he sees in the Mother, as in a glass, the Genetrix of everything. For one thing always lies in another, and the more is sought, the more is found, and there is no need to cast the mind beyond this world, for all is to be found in this world, yea, in everything that lives and moves. Whatsoever any looks upon and searches into, he shall find the Spirit with the Fiat therein and the divine virtue discovers or beholds itself in all things, as has been said, "the Word is near thee, even in thy heart and lips." For when the Light of

God dawns or breaks forth in the center of the Spirit of the Soul, "then the Spirit of the Soul sees very well the creation of this world, as in a clear glass, and nothing is far off."[14]

This of course again goes back to the idea of the Macrocosm and Microcosm which is so prominent in Boehme and other mystics. As has already been indicated, this creation of the world which is perceived by the "Spirit of the Soul" is based upon a theory of opposites and a combination and reaction of highers and lowers.[15] Boehme tells us that the eternal Essence, being desirious of revealing itself to itself (to attain self-consciousness), had to conceive within itself a will; but as within itself there was no object for its will or desire, except the powerful Word, which in the tranquil eternity did not exist, the seven states of eternal nature had to be born from within. From these, then proceeded, from eternity to eternity, the powerful Word, the power, the heart, and the life of the tranquil eternity and its eternal wisdom.[16] The first quality in this process of creation begins when in order to reveal His majesty, God allows His eternal nature to so contract within itself, that a state of darkness and corporeity is brought about. *The first quality is desire* and is comparable to magnetic attraction and thus the comprehensibility of the will. As the will or egoistic tendency conceives of itself as something, this act of impressing or contracting it overshadows itself and causes itself to become darkness. This first quality is the first principle of substantiality, the dark, the solid and the force of contraction.[17]

The second quality, essence or form in motion. The will being infinite and void, it cannot find any satisfaction in taking itself as object and turning without, it becomes still more harsh and dark. It becomes the acute, the bitter, pain, and the force of expansion.[18]

The first and second qualities are in opposition to each other and there results from this conflict, *a third quality called anguish or restlessness.* This is the incessant motion of the soul which cannot find its good within itself and knows no place in which to look for it. The third quality, the anguish, is evolved in the following manner:—The hardness is fixed, the motion is fugitive; the one is centripetal, the other centrifugal; but as they are one,

and cannot separate from each other (nor from their centre) they become like a turning wheel, in which one part strives upwards and the other one in a downward direction. The hardness furnishes substantiality and weight, while the 'sting' (desire in motion) supplies spirit (will for freedom) and fugitive life. All this causes a turning around within and outwardly, having nevertheless no destination where to arrive. That which the attraction of the desire causes to become fixed is again rendered volatile by the aspiring for freedom. There then results the greatest disquietude, comparable to a furious madness, from which results a terrible anguish.[19] This all represents a macrocosmic battle which has a counterpart in man, the microcosm. In the microcosm there is the battle between matter and spirit which results in the third quality of restlessness or anguish.

Through this restless desire nature touches the Divine and makes connection with God, and through a *fourth essence or quality*, which is born as a result of this restlessness, receives salvation. This fourth essence is called the *lightning-flash*. Suddenly, however, a supernatural effort, as it were, takes place; suffering and joy clash together in one indivisible instant, the lightning flashes forth and the new being passes out of darkness into light. Henceforth the child of flesh is in possession of his own form and will develop by himself in accordance with his controlling idea; the fruit of intelligence is no longer a chaos of vague, incoherent ideas, it is conscious thought, sure of itself, entering unhesitatingly into the expression which manifests it.[20] The spirit of man is liberated after being nailed to the cross of its own desires, liberation being due to the power of fire, the lightning flash. In this microcosm man is represented by the inward battle between good and evil, between the higher and lower impulses, between ideals and material self-seeking which results in anguish or restlessness. This desire and longing for eternal freedom ignites the lightning-flash, conquers the darkness and then leads on to the *fifth quality of love*. This quality is evolved by means of the four preceding qualities. Under its influence the passions of egotism disappear. Water is the symbol used for this fifth essence for by means of this the flame of passion is extinguished, thus giving a new birth or baptism in the spirit.

The first three principles are merely qualities conducive to life, the fourth is life itself, but the fifth is the true Spirit. Whenever this power has been evolved from the fire, it lives within all the others and changes them all into its own sweet nature, so that painfulness and enmity cannot be found therein in any shape whatever.[21]

The sixth form of eternal nature is intelligent life or sound. The qualities being all in a state of equilibrium in the light (love, the fifth), they now rejoice and acquire audibility. Thereby the desire of the unity enters into a state of (conscious) willing and acting, perceiving and feeling.[22] To constitute audible life, or the sound of the powers, hardness and softness, compactness and thinness and motion are required. To constitute the sixth principle there are therefore required all the other qualities of nature. The first form furnishes hardness, the second motion; by means of the third, division takes place. The fire flash changes the harshness of the conceived essence by consuming it into a spiritual being, representing mildness and softness, and this becomes formed into sound, according to the qualities which it contains.[23] The sixth quality, sound, must not be confused with terrestrial audible sound for in the light of God, i. e., the kingdom of heaven or the consciousness of the spirit, sound is very subtle, very sweet and very lovely. It is perfect stillness when compared with terrestrial noise. Nevertheless in the realm of glory it is indeed comprehensible sound, and there is a language which is heard by the angels—a language which is, however, only partaking of the nature of their world.[24]

The seventh principle or quality is the corporeal comprehension of the other qualities. It is called Essential Wisdom, the Body of God, or the Spirit of Harmony. This is a state of pure holiness and goodness. Boehme speaks of it as the eternal uncreated heaven or the Kingdom of God. The seventh form is the state of being wherein all the others manifest their activity, like the soul in the body. It is called Nature, and also the eternal essential wisdom of God.[25] The seventh spirit of God is the body, being born from the other six spirits, and in it all the celestial figures are taking form. From it arises all beauty, all joy. If this spirit did not exist, God would be imperceptible.[26]

Through this eternal generating process God becomes manifest. The Holy Trinity is present throughout this generating process, God the Father being the consciousness of force, God the Son, the consciousness of good and light, while God the Holy Ghost is the consciousness of the harmony set up in God between force and good. God generates Himself in man, reflects Himself in man and that is the reason Boehme tells us that it is in the depths of this consciousness that he seeks after divinity. Because God thus generates and reflects Himself in man, man can be made acquainted with divine generation. Furthermore, it is necessary to keep in mind the fact that the growth of God, of nature, of ourselves, all follow the same principles of opposites, each proceeding on its own scale of being, each being related to the other. They are also necessary for both the manifestation of God and the manifestation of the mystic's full personality and ethical stature.

The manifestation of the angels takes place through the seven qualities mentioned above, but the body of the angels—that is to say, its apprehensibility, originates from the seventh spirit, and the generating powers in that body are the seven spirits.[27] The names, rank and characteristics of these angels do not concern us here, with the exception of Lucifer, who will be discussed presently.

Boehme's belief in "guardian angels" concerns his ethical philosophy. Although we cannot see these angels according to our external nature, they do reside within us and whenever we battle with the devil they ward off his blows, and thus they take under their protection the soul that aspires for that which is holy.[28] "Know that the devil often fights with the angels. When the soul of man is secure in God, then the devil desires to enter; but he is stopped, so that he cannot do what he wills. Whenever the soul imagines, and lustful desires begin to arise, then is the devil victorious."[29] But Boehme also tells us that the devil is the poorest of all creatures for he cannot move a leaf upon a tree unless the wrath is contained in it. In other words, each principle is attracted by, knows and loves that which is like unto its own self. The principles existing within the periphery are acting upon their corresponding principles in the centre.

Love acts upon love, hate upon hate; good is attracted by good, and evil by evil. If there is no evil desire active in man, evil influences cannot take root in his soul. In other words, man without a given principle would be unable to recognize the corresponding principle in nature. For example, a man without love would not know what love is. This is of course an interesting echo of Empedocles.[30]

Both angels and man have the power of choice between good and evil. The fourth form or essence provides the knowledge of these ethical opposites and the spirit being born in this lightning flash, it can go either backwards or forward. The spirit is free to make the choice. In the principle of fire is the turning-point. There the will may move in whatever direction it chooses. If it desires the 'Nothing', i. e., freedom, it must sacrifice itself to the fire, and sink in the death of that principle. Then the Father, the eternal Will to nature, will put it into the will of the Son; where for the great deal which that being has given, it will receive *all;* but not to its own honour, but for the glorification and power of God. When this is accomplished, God in such a man is his will and his doing, and his fire becomes a light and a clear mirror; but if he does not will to do so, but wishes to be himself a master, and to possess multiplicity for his own self; then must he enter into the severe astringency, into the world of darkness, and cannot conduct himself in his principles higher than up to the fire, or rather only up to the lightning flash. He remains in darkness, because only freedom outside of nature can supply the light and the clearness.[31]

Lucifer likewise could have retained his glorious position, his fall being an act of his own free will. He had before him all the light of God, but his pride and fiery lust caused him and his followers to go away from the true light.[32] God did not create hell or other places of torment for Lucifer and his followers that deserted Him, but as soon as the devils went out of the light and attempted to rule by the power of fire over the beatitude in the heart of God, in the same moment they were outside of God and in the four lower qualities of eternal nature. Thereby they were kept imprisoned in the abyss of hell.[33] The cause of the devil's suffering is from within himself, and the same is true for men as

according to Boehme man creates his own hell and punishes himself. The Christian account of the fall of man is followed essentially by Boehme, but the thing which must be kept in mind is the Freedom of Will on the part of all men.

However, the problem before the mystic Boehme is to get back again to God and live the perfect life which he so much desires and which Adam led before the fall. Boehme is a wise enough psychologist to recognize the difficulty of a direct battle with "sin" and "evil". He points out the way to other mystics who desire to turn to God by showing the way he has gone and which he has tried. When the "beasts" of evil are discovered within, man should in that very moment take a resolution, and bring himself into a will to depart from that bestial will, and by true repentance turn to God and goodness. And being he cannot do it by his own power, let him take the promise of Christ unto himself, when he said, "Seek, and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you. . . . No son asketh bread of his father, and he giveth him a stone; or an egg, and he giveth him a scorpion. And if you, that are evil, can give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall my heavenly Father give the Holy Ghost to them that ask Him for it?"[34] Boehme insists that the fallen one must come to Christ with absolute confidence in His promises and give up his own will to God.

In the Mysterium Magnum he also tells us that "The only true way by which God may be perceived in His word, His essence, and His will, is that man arrive at the state of unity with himself, and that—not merely in his imagination, but in his *will*—he should leave everything that is his personal self, or that belongs to that self, money and goods, father and mother, brother and sister, wife and child, body and life, and that his own self should become as nothing to him. He must surrender everything and become poorer than a bird in the air that owns a nest. Man must have no nest for his heart in this world." Not that a person should run away from his home and desert his wife, child or relatives, commit suicide, or throw away his property, so that he may not be therein corporeally; but he should kill and annihilate his self-will, the will that claims all these

things as its possessions. He should surrender all this to his Creator, and say with the full consent of his heart, "Lord, all is Thine! I am unworthy to govern it, but as You have placed me therein, I shall do my duty by surrendering my will wholly and entirely to You. Act through me in what manner You will, so that Thy will shall be done in all things, and all that I am called upon to do may be done for the benefit of my brothers, to whom I am serving according to Thy command." He who enters into such a state of supreme resignation enters into divine union with Christ, so that he sees God Himself. He speaks with God and God speaks with him, and he thus knows what is the Word, the Essence, and the Will of God.[35]

No work which the mystic may do without the will of God, can reach the kingdom of God. "It is all but unprofitable imagery in this great turmoiling of mankind; for nothing is pleasing to God, but what He Himself does by the will, as His instrument. For there is but One only God in the Essence of all Essences, and all that which works with Him in that essence, is One Spirit with Him, but that which works in itself, in its own will, is in itself, without being under His dominion. It is indeed in that dominion wherewith He ruleth every life, but not in that holy Divine government in Himself, but in that dominion of Nature wherewith He governeth evil and good; nothing is *Divine* which walketh and worketh not in the will of God."[36] In other words, Boehme solves all ethical problems by a complete submission to God's will or Divine guidance. This submission was very helpful in the life of Jacob Boehme and yielded high ethical results which may readily be defended upon pragmatic grounds. But such an attitude of submission has at times been very bad from the point of view of ethical philosophy.

This is illustrated historically by two religious groups the Beguines and Beghards, sometimes called the "Brothers of the Free Spirit." By the fourteenth century their teachings "began everywhere to show signs of an undiluted Pantheism, with two concomitants, harmful alike to religion and to morals. One was that the man guided by the Spirit, in whose special age or dispensation many of these 'brethren' believed themselves to live, was above any further attention to outward forms sacra-

ments or ceremonies; the other that, being filled with the Spirit, any and every urgent impulse in him was Divine. Pure Pantheism always leads in the direction of Libertinism by blurring necessarily the distinction between right and wrong; when a man believes himself to be in some realm of the Spirit, beyond law, a 'perfect soul' that has risen above the practice of virtues and is on the way to becoming identified with the Divine Allness that fills him, there is no possible check to his actions."[37] This was condemned as a heresy by the Council of Vienna in 1311.

There is no trace of moral laxity in Boehme and he insists time and time again that the man who has yielded to God does no evil, but if he does evil, then he has not yielded. There is no trace of compromise in Boehme on matters of ethics. Whatever may be the theological basis for this added strength in living, one is forced to admit with Royce that there is *a something* which makes the mystic different from other more "average" persons. This *something* of the mystic is the common spirit of all the higher religions which he breathes "when he conceives his goal as an inner salvation, and his search for truth as essentially a practical effort to win personal perfection. It is no wonder then that the mystics have been the spiritual counsellors of humanity. . . . Mysticism has been the ferment of the faiths, the forerunner of spiritual liberty, the inaccessible refuge of the nobler heretics, the inspirer, through poetry, of countless youth who knew no metaphysics, the comforter of those who are weary of finitude."[38]

Other ethical implications and demands can be seen in the scala perfectionis previously mentioned which is developed in nearly all mystical systems. In the climb toward the perfect, the common virtues and everyday duties are insisted upon. Ewald insists that the true mystic does not withdraw himself from the smallest business of life. The first stage of the ladder is spoken of as the "Purgative Stage" which "includes contrition, confession, hearty amendment, and also, which is interesting, the social and civic virtues."[39] Plotinus claims that these represent the "Divine qualities of order and limitation". The mystics remind us that the first stage in seeing truth, is to make ourselves truthful and real in our living. Only the pure of

heart may see God and "man must clean his mirror if God is to be reflected in it." After these small and outward duties become natural and habitual, we are able to devote our strength to the struggle centered in the inner life. Plotinus expressed this well when he said "Every man should begin by making himself beautiful and divine if he would behold the Beautiful and the Divine."[40]

St. John is generally considered as the most mystical of the apostles and we find many passages in his writings which have a most striking mystical as well as ethical implication. He writes "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."[41] We see here a much later stage in the scala perfectionis, namely, that of union of the believer with his Incarnate Lord. Fleming feels that this unifying process is gradual and progressive, exemplified by the figure of starting from a seed. Rufus M. Jones points out that the mystics frequently use the word seed to express the "implanting of the Divine Life" in the soul. This implanted seed then grows and the new life principle thus expanded, becomes the life of the person, enabling him to resist the tendencies toward evil. The mystic then lives unto God. He is enabled to live "a life of infinitely, extended relations, life that is life indeed in its realities of interaction, service, helpfulness. . . ."[42]

The steps in the "deepening" process are also frequently mentioned by Boehme. The cosmic creation as well as the creation of the individual's character and personality involve the seven principles previously mentioned—as in the macrocosm so is it in the microcosm. Of his experiencing of the Spirit of Light, Boehme writes: "For, the Spirit of the Light loved my Soul exceedingly, as the impartial reader will see therein how the Spirit hath exercised itself, and repeated many things very often and ever deeper and clearer, from one step to another. It was the right Jacobs Ladder, upon which my soul climbed up, through God's Will, whom it also pleased so to exercise me, and to bring me into the Heavenly School, into the Holy Ternary."[43]

E. I. Watkins argues for the ethical and pragmatic value of mystical experience for the mystic does receive "in and from

his experience a satisfaction of consciousness and will, a fullness of spiritual life and energy, a certainty of communion with an ultimate and Divine Reality external to himself, that is in obvious excess of all that he has obtained by the exertion of his conscious faculties, a reality and life indefinitely superior to and quite other than the knowledge of religious truth and the force of spiritual life obtained by conscious instruction and religious exercises. This reality and life must, therefore, have been received into the subconscious depths of the soul from a source external to the soul".[44] His general reason for this seems to be that the result cannot be greater than its cause. In addition, as this experience of the mystic consists of a conviction of a contact with and an experience of an objective being or reality other than the mystic himself, "if the mystic be not really in touch with a Being outside himself, his entire spiritual life is based upon an experience which is essentially illusion and self-deception. Can we in reason believe that the lives and work of the mystics are thus the fruit of illusion and hallucination? . . . The result of illusion must surely be the detriment, indeed the destruction, of the soul's higher life, in proportion to the closeness of relationship between the illusion and that of life. Illusion and unreality must ever produce emptiness and death, never fullness and life. The result of mystical experience, however, has been the growth and elevation of life. Hence that experience cannot be illusory."[45]

In this chapter the ethical philosophy of Boehme has been explained and it is to be noted that again pragmatic principles are introduced as a defense to his ethical ideas. His theory of opposites threatens at times to result in a dualistic system, but he himself insists strongly that it is not. Such writers on philosophy as William Turner pay little attention to such protests and speak of the dualism in his system. We can readily see that Boehme's language will lend itself at times to rather unfortunate interpretations. Any system of ethics based upon "divine guidance" of any sort, even though aided by guiding angels, is not likely to be as definite as desirable, but if this principle is taken in connection with the life of the mystic *as a whole*, it has great significance as an ethical criteria. In addition, it has the

advantage of giving to the mystic the helpful thought of a greater power within working for good, which as suggested before has no little pragmatic value.

Leuba records the interesting case of Miss X who was a professor of a branch of natural science in an American College. Although she did not believe in God, she successfully created a mental God to aid her overcome difficulties and temptations! Pragmatically, her God did exist for her and certainly filled her "transcendental needs" successfully. But the fact that some may create a mental God to satisfy their transcendental needs does not imply that *all* who claim a belief in or an experience of God do so. An influx of moral and ethical energy may arise from supernatural external sources, natural external sources, or subjective internal sources.

Many have mingled the ethical, the aesthetic and the mystical together, basing their apology for mysticism on aesthetic grounds as well as pragmatic grounds. "I may say that the peculiar happiness which accompanies every glimpse or insight into truth and reality, whether in the scientific, aesthetic, or emotional sphere, seems to me to have a greater apologetic value than has generally been recognized."[46] We must at least admit that if the joy of the mystic and his happiness are as great as claimed it is very much worth while to give it a small part of our time and attention. If happiness and pleasure are to be taken as tests of reality and considered as ends of human existence, then hedonists have overlooked a possibly very fruitful field. And furthermore, should we not find truth and reality by the mystic path, we at least reach "beauty and music of the soul" and our quest will by no means have been utterly in vain, nor our time wasted. "Beauty," says Hegel in one of his works, "is merely the Spiritual making itself known sensuously."

"A shadowy companion (is Beauty), half seen, half guessed at, she keeps step with the upward march of life: and we receive her message and respond to it, not because we understand it, but because we *must*. Here it is that we approach that attitude of the self, that point of view, which is loosely and generally called mystical."[47] So it may be that that which to the artist is Beauty, is that which to the mystic is Reality—and hence the

usual approach wrong! The artist sees Beauty and knows that he records it poorly. The mystic may see reality and know likewise that he records it poorly. This would imply that there is no objective standard for Beauty accepted generally. Even as "beauty is in the eyes of the beholder" so might truth be in heart or mind of the mystic experiencer. "In the good, the beautiful, the true," says Rudolph Eucken, "we see Reality revealing its personal character. They are parts of a coherent and substantial world."[48] Here, some of the veils of that substantial world are stripped off; Reality peeps through, and is recognized dimly, or actually, by the imprisoned self. Récéjac also develops this idea when he says that if the mind penetrates deeply into the facts of aesthetics, it will find more and more, that these facts are based upon an ideal identity between the mind itself and things. At a certain point the harmony becomes so complete, and the finality so close that it gives us actual emotion. The Beautiful then becomes the sublime; a brief apparition, by which the soul is caught up into the true mystic state, and touches the Absolute. It is scarcely possible to persist in this aesthetic perception without feeling lifted up by it above things and above ourselves, in an ontological vision which closely resembles the Absolute of the Mystics.[49]

In the mystics such as Boehme we have a distinct mingling of the aesthetic, the religious, and the ethical, as well as the metaphysical. Things to which the mystics respond in an aesthetic way are the sublime grandeur and the beauties of an ideal spiritual life. In the lives of the mystics the phrase "Beauty of Holiness" takes on new meaning. "Every beautiful object, whatever be the kind of beauty which it especially emphasizes and represents, is beautiful because it suggests in a concrete way some one or more of the characteristics of an ideal spiritual life."[50] We see in the lives of many of the mystics a complete reversal of the ordinary standards of beauty in the interest of the ideal spiritual life, as they force themselves to do the most loathsome tasks and consider them "sweet" and "pleasant" because leading to a larger life and closer union with their Lord. A worshipful attitude toward beauty and a spiritual ideal makes "man morally better by bringing him nearer to the ideal of a

perfect spiritual life."[51] The mystics renounce all in their worship of the all-beautiful and noble ideal of this perfect spiritual life. Evelyn Underhill says of the mystic and his love of the ethically beautiful, "In his worship of Perfect Beauty faith must be balanced by works. By means of veils and symbols he must interpret his free vision, his glimpse of the burning bush, to other men. He is the mediator between his brethren and the divine, for art is the link between appearance and reality."[52] Reality is seen through the beautiful and an experience of the beautiful strips off some of the veils of this substantial world.

In R. B. Haldane, a writer of an entirely different sort, we find a similar thought. In his "Gifford Lectures" for 1903 he said, "And yet in various phases of life which are not theoretical, I do transcend my standpoint. The artist, the moral being, the religious man . . . they seem to escape from the closed circle. They touch a higher level; it seems as if they could comprehend at a higher plane of intelligence and thereby they show us how even finite beings can approach near to God."[53] Approach near to God? The mystics tell us of their experiencing of God, of Perfect Beauty, of the Absolute, but what may this God or this THAT be that the mystics do claim they have experienced? Is He or THAT personal or impersonal in character? The French Philosopher, Renan, considered that the God of the mystics is in the nature of a fulfillment of a "transcendental need." Their God to whom they aspire and for whom they crave, corresponds to their ideal needs. He is in the nature of a transcendental summary of their spiritual and emotional needs. The literature of the mystics is filled with prayers of longing for God, prayers for communion with him. Does an outside being answer these prayers in the orthodox view of Deity or does a Deity corresponding to their needs fulfill their wants and satisfy their type of soul or mind?

We have already stated that some explanation based upon the subconscious may be given, but that many cases of mystical phenomena are thereby excluded. The Deity no doubt makes use of the normal nervous equipment of the experiencer, but the validity of the experience is not thereby denied. One has said of such experiences, "We declare them to be divine (the mystical

phenomena) when they impose themselves upon us with the kind of superior authority we are compelled to call divine, when they uphold the individual and increase the power of action."[54]

We see that a consideration of Boehme's mystical philosophy leads to a pragmatic and ethical consideration, which in turn leads to an aesthetic approach to the problem. But pragmatism, ethics and aesthetics soon lead to the deeper problems of appearance, reality, truth and the Absolute, so it is necessary to consider Boehme's mysticism in the light of these deeper problems. Boehme himself realized that it was important to know the source of this "light", for a "man kindled fire" is not the same as a "Divinely kindled" one. "We must give Divine fuel to our soul's fire, if it be to burn in a Divine source or quality, and if a Divine light be to shine from it. Earthly fuel giveth an earthly source or quality, and a light according to that source or quality. Whatsoever a man kindleth in himself, THAT burneth in him."[55]

V

The Search of the Mystic Boehme for Ultimate Realty and Truth

We have seen that the object of Boehme's search was a personal, intimate and loving Deity, although he frequently warns of the Devil's counterfeit mystical experiences. The true mystic must feed his soul's fire with divine fuel in order to obtain full stature in the ethical and spiritual life, that is, in order to attain to the "Beauty of Holiness." The objection at once arises that the mystic experience is but an illusion and not an experience of ultimate reality and truth. The inadequacy of the psychological explanation has already been pointed out and as far as possible simply upon the basis of Boehme's writings. That his mysticism has some pragmatic and ethical value may be admitted, but the claim of "illusion" and "hallucination" may still be insisted upon by many.

Many mystics have pointed out that should we characterize their experiences as illusions, they might well remind us that our world of experience is not so well and logically founded that we can stigmatize their experience as impossible or illusory. "Is your world of experience so well and logically founded that you dare make of it a standard? Philosophy tells you that it is founded on nothing better than the reports of your sensory apparatus and traditional concepts of the race. Certainly it is imperfect, probably it is illusion; in any event, it never touches the foundation of things. Whereas what the world, which truly knows nothing calls 'mysticism' is the science of ultimates—the science of self-evident Reality, which cannot be 'reasoned about', because it is the object of pure reason or perception."[1]

E. I. Watkins makes a somewhat different appeal for the validity of mysticism. He warns us against Evelyn Underhill's attempt "to contrast the objective validity of mystical experience with the mainly subjective and illusory character of sense perception."[2] The things we ordinarily call real are objectively real, but "just as the fact of sense perception carries with it an

immediate certainty of the existence of an external object of that perception, so also does mystical experience involve an immediate certainty of the existence of an external object of that experience."[3] Of course, most philosophers do not grant quite so much for sense perception and even granting the existence of an external object which is the object or "cause" of the perception, we still may have no knowledge of the real nature of the external object, i. e., the "ding an sich". This problem constantly arises in mysticism just as it does in every phase of philosophy. Others have discussed the same problem in more theological terms which we should consider.

Lasson reminds us in similar connections that Rationalism cannot conduct us to the essence of things. We need intellectual vision. Now "the essence of mysticism is the assertion of an intuition which transcends the temporal categories of the understanding, relying on subjective reason" and as mysticism "is not content with symbolic knowledge—it aspires to see the Absolute by pure spiritual apprehension."[4] He goes on to argue that to regard God as "the immanent Essence of all things," and yet as "an abstraction transcending all things" is a contradiction. If we desire to maintain distinctions in things and avoid monopsychism we must of course avoid strict pure immanence. We see the doctrine of "Divine Immanence" developed in Eckhart's mysticism in one of its possible ways. "This is closely connected with his tenet as to the Divine 'spark', 'das Funkelein', which is 'the ground of the soul', its means of union with the Divine Nature, the part or 'apex' of the spirit whereby the spirit is gradually unified with God and becomes God-like. At first Eckhart thought that this something of God in us, whereby we respond to God, was a created function, a residue of the Divine left in man, and in this sense it had been inculcated by Albertus Magnus, Aquinas and Bonaventura; but, later, Eckhart went further and said that the 'Funkelein' was the very true life of the soul, in fact was God Himself in man. 'Diess Funkelein, das ist Gott.' He beats down all series of emanations betwixt the soul and God, all grades of ascent to God, all mediation between God and the soul. The systems of Dionysius and the scholastics alike disappear. God is simply and already there in this 'spark' of the soul, the Divine essence itself."[5]

Before the time of Eckhart, Jean Gerson had developed his explanation and theory of illumination upon the basis of an "affective faculty" which is the point of contact or receptivity in the spirit, reason and the senses. This "affective faculty" in the case of mystical vision is called "synteresis". This term corresponds to what some mystics have called the "Divine spark", or the "apex" of the soul. It is considered higher than the reasoning faculty and provides the means for the reception of truth directly from God. But what does the mystic learn through this "affective faulty", what does he report concerning the nature of God, for example, with whom he has just been in contact? Generally his answer is as disappointing as is this one from Hooker: "Our safest eloquence concerning Him is our silence, when we confess . . . that His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach."[6]

But some refuse to make any assertions about God, they refuse to use symbols and instead of adding innumerable attributes to God they eliminate all analogies and descriptive phrases. Those thus following what is called the "Via Negativa" really praise him through their silence. This is the opposite pole to pantheism in which all is God. St. Augustine taught the "Via Negativa" when he said, "We must not even call God ineffable—since this is to make an assertion about Him. He is above every name that can be named. . . . He is best adored in silence; best known by nescience; best described by negatives."[7] Dionysius likewise taught the approach to God through the "Via Negativa". The "apathy" of the soul while in communion with God is a similar thought found in the teachings of Clement of Alexandria.

Boehme teaches a certain type of "apathy" or "Via Negativa," but uses a better term, namely, "True Resignation". (Von wahrer Gelassenheit). He does not attempt such a detailed analysis of the process of knowing of ultimate reality and truth as does Eckhart, but *insists* on a will resigned to God in whom all things are seen. Knowledge of the meaning and essence of things is then given in proportion to the mystic's resignation and need. Boehme writes, "Moreover, God has given him (i. e. man) higher and greater knowledge than this, in that he can penetrate

into the heart of everything, and discern what essence, virtue, and property it has, both in the creatures, in earth, stones, trees, herbs, in all moveable and immovable things; also in the stars and elements, so that he knows what substance and virtue they have, and that in their virtue, all natural sensibility, vegetation, multiplication, and life, consist."[8]

Boehme again writes of our knowing: "Our seeing and knowing is in God. He reveals to everyone in this world as much as He wills, and as much as He knows will be useful and good to him." We are not in possession of our own selves. We know nothing of God. God Himself is our knowing and seeing. We are nothing, so that He may be all in us. We should be blind and deaf and mute, and know nothing and know of no life of our own, so that He may be our life and our soul, and that our work may be His.[9]

Boehme uses a very interesting argument to supplement his statements as to the working and action of God. We can analyze growing things, for example, into their constituent parts, but yet not find any "growing" in them. This "growing" is the Eternal Root or God. The same is true of human beings, although we can see nothing but flesh and blood by our own light. This is the type of knowledge of ultimate things to which reason leads us according to Boehme. We do have knowledge of God through His external creation, although the real knowledge of the essence of things comes through mystical experiencing.[10]

Many mystical writers insist that those of us who have not explored for ourselves this territory described by the mystics, owe the same attention to these pioneers and explorers of the spiritual world as we would give to the explorers of countries into which we have not had the opportunity to adventure for ourselves. Is it quite fair to deny their discoveries and to consider them invalid because we have not had the courage or the opportunity to explore for ourselves? The road is open to all, so they have told us over and over again. But such regions are for the adventurous, for the discoverers. The pioneers and "civilization" will follow the discoverers and they and the pioneers will get very little of the credit!

Evelyn Underhill claims likewise that those who state that they have established communication with the only reality

"should claim from us the same attention that we give to other explorers of countries in which we are not competent to adventure ourselves; for the mystics are the pioneers of the spiritual world, and we have no right to deny validity to their discoveries, merely because we lack the opportunity or the courage necessary to those who would prosecute such explorations for themselves."[11]

A somewhat similar view, although more clearly thought out, is taken by Edmond Holmes in a paper published in *The Hibbert Journal*.[12] Coventry Patmore had said that "mysticism is the science of reality." But Edmond Holmes feels that "science" is not quite the right word. There is really more of art than of science in the mystic's treatment of his subject. "But that his subject is reality can scarcely be doubted. The mystics are the pioneers, the leaders of mankind in the quest of God, in the exploration of the unmapped realms of reality."[13]

The conceptions of God are many and various, but the basic idea seems to be the idea of *Ultimate Reality*. Now the word ultimate has vast significance. We must not think of the Real and the Unreal as "mutually exclusive alternatives, between which we must make our choice." Nor must we confound reality with actuality and the unreal with the non-existent. To speak of "Ultimate" reality implies gradations of reality. Of course, if there is "Ultimate" reality, there must also be "Ultimate" unreality. These two opposite poles of a world process must each imply the other. "Far from being mutually exclusive, they are so related to one another that each of them implies the other and is in a sense lost without it. It follows that acceptance of the word 'ultimate' as predicable of reality, has logical consequences which are far-reaching and revolutionary."[14] People are apt to use the terms "supreme reality", "innermost reality" and "ultimate reality" without fully realizing the total consequences of such phrases when logically considered. In respect of their actuality, i. e., of the fact of their existence, things are all equal, be it germ or constellation. However, the actual is evaluated in terms of the real.

"The standards of worth which we apply to things are all determined by our conceptions of reality; and the varying values of the actual are all measurable in the last resort in terms of the

real. The supreme ideals by reference to which we arrange the objects of our experience in an informal order of merit—the True, the Beautiful, the Good—are high realities which seem to converge, as we follow them in the direction of their own infinitude, on the ultimate reality which we call God."[15]

But granting that we measure the actual in terms of the real and that gradations of worth reduce themselves to gradations of reality, by what means or standard are we to measure reality? There seems to be but one standard, "an inward standard; a standard which is inherent in selfhood." It is through our consciousness of self that we recognize gradation in reality. The difference between higher and lower self, between deeper and shallower self is a valid difference and "the difference is in each case a difference in the grade or level of reality." The lower self is less real than the higher self. The higher self announces itself as more real and Holmes feels that we must accept it on its own valuation. When we try to live up to the ideal erected by our higher or more real self we are responding to the call of reality.

Now if it is in self that we have experience of the different degrees of reality it must needs follow that "it is in self that the quest of ultimate reality is to be carried on." This can only be done by making ourselves more and more real, that is, "by trying to raise the level of self, to widen self, to deepen self, to open the eyes of self." The quest of the mystic after God becomes a quest of ultimate reality and this resolves itself into a quest of the real self. All of us are of course engaged in this quest of the real self in one way or another, but the mystic gets "deeper into his own depths, deeper into heart of reality" than the rest of us.

We would all like to know what he finds in the depths of self, but his "conviction of the transcendent reality of his experience is only equalled by his feeling of impotence when he tries to describe it." Language has terms for the expression of common experiences, but those of the mystic are peculiarly his own. We must likewise make allowances for his particular religious and philosophical influences in order to find what he has in common with other mystics. His temperamental idiosyncrasies, his

theological training, and environmental influences provide merely surface results on his inner life. At first it would seem that the mystic was alone, alone with his vision of reality and his real self. But it is here "where he seems to be most entirely isolated, that he enters into communion with those who have travelled as far as he has along the Mystic Way. They are bound by sacred bonds as they are sharers in an inward and spiritual experience which defies expression, sharers in a union, living, intimate, more than personal, with what is at once all-inclusive and transcendently real."[16]

They are not boastful of their discovery, but in all humility speak of the rapturous joy from having succeeded in their task. "The glorious God is the whole essence of things both visible and invisible." "My ME is God, not by simple participation, but by a true transformation of my Being." "God is my Being, my Me, my Strength, my Beatitude, my Goal, my Delight." "The love of God is our true self-love, the love characteristic of and directed to our true selves." Such are some of the expressions of St. Catherine of Genoa. Other mystics say in substance, "Lose self and you will find self. Pass beyond self into the selfless life, and you will become one by transformation of your being with ultimate reality, with God."[17]

This is in substance the position of Jacob Boehme. He would have us lose ourselves in God, surrender ourselves to His will, and then in a mystic union with Christ we will find our true selves. We are to pass into a selfless life in which God's will is our will and thus we gradually become transformed into the likeness of the second person of the Godhead.[18] This goal for Boehme is called God, although a few other mystics have used the words Absolute, Transcendent, the Infinite. Such mystical experiencing of God or the Absolute is not merely a "unitive state", but a "unitive process", for this union with the "Real" is a process, an eternal process, not a state. Each experience of Boehme added to the possibilities of new and deeper experiences. Each time he saw God, reality became clearer and he felt more keenly the unity of All in Christ. Boehme says that we are all one body in Christ, and have all the Spirit of Christ within our reach. If, then, we enter into the Christ, we may see and know

everything by the power of His Spirit.[19] This does not mean however, that "Ultimate Reality" has been reached, but it remains an approachable ideal for other and fuller experiences, as well as providing a unifying and integrating factor.

Furthermore we must not forget that this movement of mystic consciousness towards this consummation is not a sudden admission to an overwhelming vision of Truth: rather is it "an ordered movement towards ever higher levels of reality, ever closer indentification with the Infinite."[20] Some mystics have thus viewed life as becoming, as changing, as "vitalism." We have already seen this state of "becoming" in Boehme's strife of opposites and eternal generation of God. It is a life in which we interpret phenomena and build up our natural world. In this building up of our world it is of interest to note that if we let human consciousness change or transcend its rhythm, then any other aspect of any other world may be ours as a result. "Hence the mystics' claim that in their ecstasies they change the conditions of consciousness, and apprehend a deeper reality which is unrelated to human speech, cannot be dismissed as unreasonable."[21] Consciousness may be likened to movies and if we change speed then things change in appearance. But what is the reality? What is the "real" thing which thus changes in appearance? The answer to this question by Boehme is quite clear. The only real thing, the only reality is God. The things of "appearance" are thus perceived because of the fallen nature of man. Real knowledge comes only from the spirit and by opening ourselves to the "rhythm" of God. Lack of understanding is due to the weakness of flesh and blood, and as Boehme puts it, "the craftiness of the devil."

Some mystics like to speak of mysticism as the science of self-evident reality but non-mystics are respectfully doubtful about the "self-evident" features. Our knowledge is true or real only to the extent that our ideas conform to the reality of things. None of the means suggested is of value unless the results are true or real, that is, conform to the reality of things. Locke and others have recognized that the mind does not know things immediately, but only by the intervention of the ideas it has of them, although we seem to still be in rather complete darkness about

the reality of things and have no way of telling what is real or true even though we should meet such. Most thinkers are not quite at rest unless there is something real or some unchanging Absolute. For example, Spencer felt that unless a real non-relative or Absolute were postulated, the relative itself would become absolute. The mystics have always been afraid of appearances and things of the sense. They have been equally shy of any Spencerian "Unknowable", their goal being the attaining of this so-called "Unknowable".

Hume considered that reality consists of impressions and ideas which would make it appear as if any direct encounter with absolute truth would be impossible. Kant's epistemological dualism separates these impressions or ideas from some absolute reality and leaves a rather ominous gap between the sphere of knowledge and the sphere of reality. The mystics refuse to stop at this gap. They are not content with the sham universe of normal men and desire to break through their limitations in order to touch reality as did Jacob Boehme.

He writes of his experiencing and seeking of God and reality: "Where will you seek God? In the deep above the stars? You will not be able to find Him there. Seek Him in your heart, in the center of the birth of your life, and there you shall find Him, as our father Adam and mother Eve did.

"For it is written, 'you must be born anew through the water and the spirit, or else you shall not see the Kingdom of God.' This birth must be done within you. The heart, or the Son of God must arise in the birth of your life and then the Saviour Christ is your faithful Shepherd. You are in Him, and He is in you, and all that He and His Father have is yours, and none shall pluck you out of His hands; and as the Son (viz. the Heart of the Father) is one (with the Father) so also the new man is one in the Father and the Son, one virtue or power, one light, one life, one eternal Paradise, one eternal heavenly birth, one Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and thou His Child."[22] We see here again that there is no ominous gap for Boehme between the phenomenal and noumenon; he seeks and finds unification of life and peace in God.

Granting that the mystic Boehme did have an insight into

the real and true, what measurements do we have of his claims and how can we properly evaluate them. We have suggested some before, e. g., pragmatic aspects, ethical helpfulness, but these only lead us into deeper philosophical problems. In the case of physical objects we have some fairly constant standards, namely, scales, measuring rods, etc. These are external standards of truth, but such external standards of truth are not the only ones. Haldane has pointed out that "there is a form of truth which deserves the name just as much as truth which measurement gives us, and that is the truth which we recognize in the perfection, "say, of a great poem, nature at her best, a sunset by Turner, the life of Jesus or Buddha, or the character of a Socrates."[23]

"In all these facts there is that which appeals to our minds, to reason as well as to feeling, as indubitably the truth, and the truth in a sense which compels assent just as much as did the results we arrived at when we applied the balance, or the measuring rod, or the chronometer. In instances such as these, the test seems to be the completeness of what is expressed, its adequacy to the deepest conception in the light of which it can be judged."[24] Now in animal life, "development was called true, not when it accorded with some external standard, but when it disclosed the fulfilment of the purpose or quasi-purpose of the life of the organism. The true type, for instance, of feminine beauty is not the type which we should accept in the case of men. In like manner, in the history of Philosophy measurement was not a possible test. In this case the truth was rather to be looked for in the *adequacy* of a conception to the explanation of the matter with which it had to deal."[25] The whole history of Philosophy shows a gradual growth in depth and breadth of conceptions. This deepening and broadening process results from criticism and a reconstruction, to be again followed by another criticism and reconstruction upon a deeper and finer basis. What is judged as real and true in this process is that which harmonizes with the rest of our experience, which accounts for the somewhat relative view of truth and reality, for experience changes and deepens.

Boehme's mysticism is a deepening and broadening process

resulting from the conflict of opposites. However, in this shifting and becoming he does not have a "relative" reality, just relative appearances of such reality. The end at which we should aim according to him is the Glory of God and the salvation of our souls. With this end before Boehme we are able to see in his actions and experiences a certain "logic of coherence" as a further means of evaluating his mysticism. This logic of coherence is one of the things stressed by Bosanquet.[26] He exhibits the coherence of things which comes into view when we read the universe in the light of our highest experiences. In fact only in these highest experiences is revealed to us the coherence of the world and when we see the coherence of the world, we see it as it is. The world coherence is seen by the mystic Boehme in the light of his mystical experience and contemplation of God. Now any "logic of coherence" involves "degrees of reality", for neither we nor the mystics live constantly in any realm of highest experiences, and so do not always see the complete coherence of things, that is, things as they are. Just the same, these rare experiences do show reality in proportion as they are full and unqualified. The mystic encounters reality when he is at his fullest stretch and when not at his fullest stretch, he sees the lower degrees or grades of reality, or sees less of reality because of defects within himself.

It is such a logic as this that William James might have been willing to accept, for he certainly would not accept the cold syllogistic logic. Speaking of this cold rationalistic logic, William James said, "For my own part, I have finally found myself compelled to *give up the logic*, fairly, squarely, and irrevocably. It has an imperishable use in human life, but that use is not to make us theoretically acquainted with the essential nature of reality. Reality, life, experience, concreteness, immediacy, use what word you will, exceeds our logic, overflows and surrounds it. If you like to employ words eulogistically—you may say that reality obeys a higher logic, or enjoys a higher rationality. But I think that even eulogistic words should be used rather to distinguish than to commingle meanings, so I prefer bluntly to call reality if not irrational then at least non-rational in its constitution—and by reality here I mean reality where things happen, all temporal reality without exception."[27]

Later James adds, "I have now to confess that I should not now be emancipated, not now subordinate logic with so very light a heart, or throw it out of the deeper regions of philosophy to take its rightful and respectable place in the world of simple human practice, if I had not been influenced by a comparatively young and very original French writer, Professor Henri Bergson. If I had not read Bergson, I should probably still be blackening endless pages of paper privately, in the hope of making ends meet that were never meant to meet, and trying to discover some mode of conceiving the behaviour of reality which should leave no discrepancy between it and the accepted laws of the logic of identity."[28]

Inge likewise objects to a rationalistic and a cold logical approach to mysticism for he does not consider that the true mystic appeals to a faculty above reason, "if reason is used in its proper sense, as the logic of the whole personality.... A revelation absolutely transcending reason is an absurdity: no such revelation could ever be made.... What we can and must transcend, if we would make any progress in Divine knowledge, is not reason, but that shallow rationalism which regards the data on which we can reason as a fixed quantity, known to all and which bases itself on a formal logic, utterly unsuited to a spiritual view of things. Language can only furnish us with poor, misleading, and wholly inadequate images of spiritual facts; it supplies us with abstractions and metaphors which do not really represent what we know or believe about God and human personality."[29]

"Whatever view of reality deepens our sense of the tremendous issues of life in the world wherein we move, is for us nearer the truth than any view which diminishes that sense. The truth is revealed to us that we may have *life*, and have it more abundantly. . . . The world as it is, is the world as God sees it, not as we see it. Our vision is distorted, not so much by the limitations of finitude, as by sin and ignorance. The more we can raise ourselves in the scale of being, the more will our ideas about God and the world correspond to the reality."[30]

As has already been pointed out Boehme insisted upon the leaving behind of reason, but not in any such way that there would be any essential conflict between him and Inge as to the

place of reason in the perception of the ultimate truths. Certainly Boehme would be in absolute accord with the second quotation from Inge, both as respects the cause of our failure to see and the way to overcome our limitations. We can see in Boehme a "logic of the whole personality" as well as a "logic of coherence." This whole knowing process, the whole reasoning process is for most thinkers dualistic. The knowledge process is one of meditation in which the knower and the known are brought into harmony. To the mystic "such a mediation, resting, as it does, on a fundamental distinction between the knower and the known, never can be ultimate, never can reach reality. The process of ideation builds up a screen of unreality between the knower and the known; the only perfect satisfaction is to be found in the perfectly immediate, the absolutely individual, the pure 'this' felt and not translated by ideas into something other than itself."[31]

If we look very closely at any object, for example, a stone wall, we will no doubt see all the details, the minute structure, its color and feel, and we could reason about it—even though that were the sum total of our knowledge—and form various theories as to its origin, meaning and relationship of the various things seen or felt. Of course, our knowledge would be very limited although it might have the appearance of great profundity. It would even be great in details, but could not be properly interpreted because of lack of knowledge of its *total relationship* to the wall as a whole. This is somewhat analogous to our way of knowing, according to the mystics. One of the essential characteristics of mystical knowledge is that it is a sort of an "abiding vision of the whole, in whose light the *details of knowledge* take on changed value, changed relation."[32]

To come back to our analogy of the wall, we would be able to understand the meaning and purpose of the details after having seen the wall as a whole and the purpose of the wall. The bricks and cement which before we could see plainly will now become clear in relationship to the wall as a whole and its purpose will clearly show the purpose of the details, the purpose in the light of a logic of coherence based upon our highest experience. But mysticism is a process toward this highest experience, a process

of development toward this view of the whole. Each experience adds to and enriches the next experience. The visions of the mystics must certainly vary in degrees of clearness, and so to carry our analogy even further, thinkers see but the bricks and cement of the wall, some mystics see the wall as a whole and the relationship of the bricks and cement to the wall, while others see the place surrounded by the wall, and so on ad infinitum.

M. B. Dawkins states "that all consecutive thinking, all thinking, in the stricter sense of the word, presupposes an immediate and ever-attendant knowledge of the whole-character of reality . . . that this knowledge is essentially like the Mystic's, in that it is universal, not particular; and is not founded on any other knowledge, not on any items or aggregate of items, of knowledge about reality. This quality of insight in our thinking gains its only real distinction from typically mystical knowledge in being unattended to, out of the focus of attention, in being used as means and not as end. In the Mystic experience this phase of cognition occupies the center of attention to the exclusion, for the time being, of all other activities, and its results are considered of paramount importance."[33]

We find support for such a position from the nature of reflection. "It is an ancient puzzle—how can reflection, being as it is, a sort of self-transcendence, ever begin, and having begun, how can it go on? For any initial act of reflection presupposes a previous reflective act, and cannot be initial; to experience the goad, the urge to reflection, the mind must have already accomplished an act of reflection. This is not verbal puzzling, any dim sense of dissatisfaction, of puzzlement, implies that the self is already beyond itself—that it has overreached the limits of its knowledge —how?—So we have the puzzle—without discontent, no reflection, without reflection, no discontent—and we are forced to say that unless reflection, as the ability to stand off from one-self, view one's activity, one's knowledge, one's thinking as something apart, *is due to a propulsive power without itself of some immediate and direct character*, reflection can never begin."[34] We must have an infinite regress unless we can stop at something known directly, immediately and unquestionably. In other words knowledge can only be started with something that is knowledge.

Boehme avoids an infinite regress by starting with an eternal "God" or Absolute. No matter from what angle we view Boehme's search for ultimate reality and truth we always arrive at God in at least one of His three manifestations. He tells us many times that his books are written only for those who desire to be sanctified and united with the Supreme Power from which they have originated. Man was originally created in the image of God and although separated by the fall, there is still enough of the divine in man to make him restless and provide a propulsive power leading to reflection and seeking. There is a self-transcendence through a higher being and a guidance leading to the discontent which provides the mystic's motive power. Boehme points out that the body would die without food and so likewise the soul would die without food. From which he seems to conclude the necessary existence of the food to meet this need. In other words, the natural hunger and discontent of the soul implies the existence of the necessary means for the satisfaction of such hunger.[35]

There are several aspects of this union of the mystic with God or the Absolute, depending on whether this "final something" is viewed as a personal "Thou", or an impersonal philosophical "That". The former view is that of Boehme, and as was mentioned before, has a greater pragmatic and ethical value than the more impersonal attitude. Of course, the mystics have frequently told us that mysticism is not so much an attempt to explain this Absolute, as to experience It. In a way, this experiencing is similar to what Bergson has urged upon philosophers as a means of attaining truth.

F. H. Bradley tries to show that a unitary Absolute, complete harmonious and free from self-contradiction, is necessary to overcome the self-contradictory character of our experience framed in the categories of the intellect. "Ultimate Reality is such that it does not contradict itself—and it is proved absolute by the fact that either in endeavouring to deny it, or even in attempting to doubt it, we tacitly assume its validity."[36] "The universe is one in the sense, that its differences exist harmoniously within one whole, beyond which there is nothing."[37] Bradley shows that abstract logical thought is unable to reach this

Unity without perishing, since this function of the mind is entirely relative, discursive and discrete. It is either—or, and cannot deal with reality as being at the same time both a Unity and a Multiplicity.

How a philosophy having arrived at these conclusions may very well appear to the mystic to rationalize his own method of arriving at "absolute knowledge", is well illustrated in the "rational mysticism" of William Kingsland. Bradley contends not "merely that it is the highest *reason* to postulate this unitary absolute, but that we can and do actually know something about it intellectually and empirically, simply because all our experience falls within and qualifies the Absolute. If we do not and cannot in the very nature of thought know by means of thought what the Absolute *is*, we at least can and do know partially what it does; and this knowledge of what it does cannot be discrepant with what it *is*. If, then, we could suppose the duality inherent in thought to be transcended, thought would cease to be thought and would become something else; but in doing this it would become, paradoxically, something more rational than thought itself. 'When each fact and end has foregone its claim, as such, to be ultimate or reasonable, then reason and harmony in the highest sense has begun to appear.' That this is precisely what happens in the mystical consciousness is our main thesis throughout this present work, and we may note in Mr. Bradley's volume a most valuable contribution on the part of a pure metaphysician to the fact of this supreme rationality transcending the categories of the formal conceptual mind. That this supra-rational absolute is also the One Unitary Self may also be deduced from Mr. Bradley's work."[38]

Bradley (perhaps in an unthinking moment) states that the philosophy of the absolute is a "satisfaction of what may be called the mystical side of our nature." Evelyn Underhill likewise considers that "man has a hunger and craving for an intuition of final Unity—Aquinas said 'A natural craving cannot be in vain'. An analogy or comparison with man's other instincts and cravings assures us that these his fundamental demands always indicate the existence of a supply."[39]

Royce says that "we long for the Absolute only in so far as in

us the Absolute also longs, and seeks, through our very temporal striving, the peace that is nowhere in Time, but only, and yet absolutely, in Eternity."[40] In Royce we find a combination of the Absolute and a doctrine of unique individuals. Experience is the substance of reality and every finite idea in experience has an internal meaning embodying a purpose which is fulfilled in the Absolute. The Absolute is necessary for the fulfillment of every idea including those beyond the experience of individuals. We have already noted that the mystic Boehme finds a completion and fruition of his experience and living in a personified Absolute or God.

In contrast with this view of the experience of the mystics we find a most interesting theory of the Absolute and Reality in a Catholic writer previously quoted, namely Sharpe. According to him, in the experience of the mystics there is a real "sense-contact"; an immediate intuition of the divine Being or divine Absolute. This communication and experiencing takes place in what he calls a "transmarginal" sphere, and it may be that we become conscious of ideas derived from unnoticed sense-impressions in the same manner in which the mystic becomes conscious of the immediate divine presence. This theory of Sharpe's is not one concerning an abstract philosophical Absolute, but a personified personal Absolute. Various Catholic writers other than Sharpe have taken similar views, for example, Watkins states that mysticism is the blossoming of Christianity, the epiphany of supernatural life. In this highest experience the mystic has an immediate intuition of and contact with the Divine.

Evelyn Underhill views it as a quickening of communication of Grace to nature, of God to man—"this claim to an influx of ultimate reality, possible of assimilation by all" being that which constitutes the strength of the Christian religion. Instead of the stony diet of the philosophers "it offers to the self hungry for the Absolute that Panis Angelorun, the vivifying principle of the world. That is to say, it gives positive and experimental knowledge of and union with a supreme Personality—absorption into His mystical body—instead of the artificial conviction produced by concentration on an idea. It knits up the universe; shows the phenomenal pierced in all directions by the real and made one

with it. It provides a solid basis for mysticism; a basis which is at once metaphysical and psychological: and shows that state towards which the world's deepest minds have always instinctively aspired, as a part of the Cosmic return through Christ to God."[41]

Not only does man the individual find a unification in God, but all are also united to one another through God. Boehme constantly affirms and reaffirms the freedom of the individual souls. They are impenetrable and connected with impenetrable personalities, there being no merging into an Absolute and consequently loss of individuality or personality, but we are *all one in Christ.*[42] "Dear brother in the life of Jesus Christ, I wish from my heart the divine working love unto you, that your noble lily-twig, sprung forth in Christ, may, in the power of Christ, grow great and bring forth much fruit in the Paradise of God to the heavenly joy of us all, and our eternal brotherly fellowship .... As one branch on the tree doth enjoy the sap and power of the other, and they all do mutually grow and bear fruit in one only *power*, so likewise we are in the tree of Christ all only *one*, which (tree) *is Christ in us All.*"[43]

So again we see the workings of the mysticism of Boehme, a mystic harmony between the believer and God through Christ leading to an inner knowledge of all things. Again the individual is part of the mystic body of Christ and thus united with all of His other followers, but yet without any loss of his own individuality. As we examined Boehme's writings and life we saw some of the deeper aspects of his mysticims, but in one of the dialogues we find well summarized the particular aspect which he emphasized most strongly throughout his works and considered most important. Boehme has the Master reply to the Scholar, "Christ dwelleth really and essentially in the faith of those that wholly yield up themselves to him, and giveth them His flesh for food, and His blood for drink; and thus possesseth the ground of their faith, according to the interior and inward man. And a Christian is called a branch of the vine of Christ, and a Christian, because Christ dwelleth spiritually in him; therefore whatsoever good any shall do to such a Christian in his bodily necessities, it is done to Christ Himself, who dwelleth

in him. For such a Christian is not his own, but is wholly resigned to Christ, and has become His peculiar possession, and consequently the good deed is done to Christ Himself."[44] "So then it is no longer thy will, but the will of God; no longer the love of thyself, but the love of God, which moveth and operateth in thee; and then, being thus comprehended in it, thou art dead indeed as to thyself, but art alive unto God. So being dead thou livest, or rather God liveth in thee by His Spirit; and His love is made to thee life from the dead. Never couldst thou, with all thy seeking, have apprehended it; but it hath apprehended thee. Much less couldst thou have comprehended it. But now it hath comprehended thee and so the treasure of treasures is found."[45]

VI

Summary and Conclusions

The specific problem set before us in this thesis was to determine what truths regarding Ultimate Reality or God were perceived by such mystics as Jacob Boehme and how we were to evaluate and judge their reports. We asked ourselves, "Do the mystics have knowledge not possessed by others? Is their knowledge the same as that reached by others through reasoning and thought or is it a mere hallucination? Can the mysticism of Jacob Boehme be explained upon psychological grounds or must it be defended upon pragmatic bases?" Should we be unable to defend it upon such bases, then the problem remaining before us was to determine what epistemological or philosophical criteria, if any, we might have for evaluating Boehme's mysticism.

An examination of various definitions and criteria showed the relation and meaning of the term mysticism as used by various writers on the subject and as it applied to the writings and experiences of Boehme. Mysticism was defined as the knowing and experiencing of God or Ultimate Reality in an intimate, intense and living way, with no miracle or supernatural action thereby being implied. More specifically it was shown that the mysticism of Jacob Boehme was the knowing of God and His love, and hence the essence and inner meaning of all things, through Christ and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; God and His love being experienced through a trusting surrender to His will which includes the leading of a humble, practical, loving and moral life.

The mysticism of Boehme was seen to be in general accord with the basic criteria offered by James, Hall, Underhill and Inge, while the actual experience of Boehme were quite similar to those of such mystics as Fox and Ruysbroeck. On the other hand, Boehme's mysticism was broader than that of such a Catholic writer as Sharpe, but somewhat narrower in meaning and scope than found in the writings of Russell and Royce.

Many of the critics of mysticism view the problems involved

as chiefly psychological ones, denying that the mystics have knowledge not reached by others through reason, and so it was necessary to give attention to this aspect of the matter. The views of Nordau, Leuba, Hamilton and others were considered, but it was evident that they considered only one phase of the matter. No doubt the mystics frequently suffered from pathological disturbances (Boehme much less than most others), but such disturbances do not disprove the validity of their claims. Moreover, the widely differing explanations of these nervous disorders makes one question them all to some extent. Of these explanations, such a comfortable word as "subconscious" is probably the poorest of all, because in attempting to explain *all*, it really explains the least.

Such mystics as Boehme considered that they had an experience of God because their experiences came from beyond the margin of their own "I" and transcended their normal finiteness, thereby providing an impelling, coercive power and a higher unification of life than ordinarily known. An energy to live by did come to Boehme from somewhere and the real nature of such an experience may best be clarified by linking it up with the ethical values and pragmatic aspects of life, for his was an integrating experience rather than a disintegrating one such as "hystericals" might have. Such mystical experiences gave a new depth and beauty to his life, and can not easily be explained away as mere hallucinations.

In considering the pragmatic aspects of Boehme's mysticism one must of course consider William James. Throughout Boehme's writings we find a cheerful, happy and loving attitude, in other word, his mysticism "worked" with respect to the higher values of life. All uncertainty of the future was banished as his will was surrendered to God and in place of uncertainty, he found peace, joy and a calm repose. Boehme tried the "key" placed in his hands and found that it fitted the "moral lock" and that God was good. In the infinite perspective opening before the eyes of Boehme as his experiences deepened his life, the ideals presented to him put on an altogether new objectivity and significance. Their verification was seen to be a life process since things became richer in meaning as the opposites of good and evil battled together, with good gradually overcoming evil.

Boehme strives diligently to explain the origin of good and evil, discussing the problem in nearly all of his works. He makes use of the principle of the macrocosm and microcosm in explaining the origin of these opposites and points out that to understand God and these opposites it is necessary to generate with God, in which process He makes use of these opposing factors. A living method is required since Being alone knows Being and if we desire to know, we must place ourselves at the standpoint of God, not that man can ascend to God, but God can descend into man provided man dies to his corrupt inborn nature and gives himself up to divine action. Then as a result of this conversion of the heart, the eyes of the intelligence are opened. Although the phenomenal world is but an imperfect manifestation of the noumenal world of divine perfection, we must make use of it, studying it with our newly opened eyes and reinterpreting its clumsy metaphors and images in the light of spirit and truth.

"In Ja und Nein bestehen alle Dinge." Without struggle and opposition all would return to silence and immobility. Thus we see that good and evil are accounted for upon an Heraclitean basis. The seven qualities or principles which form the basis of the creation are: 1. Desire, the dark, the solid or the force of contraction. 2. Essence or form in motion, the acute, the bitter or the force of expansion. 3. Anguish or restlessness which results from the opposites 1 and 2. 4. Lightning-flash. 5. Love. 6. Intelligent life or sound and, 7. Essential Wisdom, the Body of God, or the Spirit of Harmony. Man grows and develops in the same way because of the principle of the macrocosm and microcosm; there is the strife of opposites within man as well as in creation and nature.

The ethical problem of the mystic Boehme is to get back again to God and live the perfect life such as Adam led before the fall. Man has freedom of will and so the way to reach this ethical state is for man to arrive at a state of unity with himself, not merely in his imagination, but in his will. To do this it is necessary for him to leave behind everything pertaining to his personal self and surrender all to God. Because of the ethical success obtained by Boehme, he is entitled to a hearing and his claims

should be received with the greatest consideration. This is not a mere overcoming of evil, but implies a positive goodness and the building of a beautiful character and life. Boehme realized that in order to see the Divine and the Beautiful he must first make himself such. The symbol of the Beautiful for him was the life of Christ Jesus and we hence find in his mysticism an aesthetic verification combined with ethical and pragmatic ones.

We agree with Watkins that the result of an illusion in this particular would have resulted in a very shallow, hollow character if not the destruction of the higher life of the soul. Boehme himself insists that for the fires of the soul to burn with divine beauty they must be fed with divine fuel, and not with the fuel of man for an effect cannot be greater than its cause.

Just as the artist and musician comprehend things which cannot be reached through reason and thought so such mystics as Boehme have a knowledge of Spiritual Realities and the Ethically Beautiful which is not possessed by others. Such knowledge we have seen cannot be fully accounted for upon psychological grounds, and certainly not considered as a mere hallucination. Those who are too insistent upon the claim of the illusory character of the mystic's experiences are reminded that everyday experiences will not stand too thorough an investigation, nor have thinkers using ordinary methods of reasoning arrived at as much knowledge concerning the essence of things as might be desired.

Boehme insists that God has given man higher and greater knowledge than is reached by reason or ordinary sense experience and thus man is able to penetrate into the heart of everything and to discern the essence of all things. Considering the mystic as a discoverer or pioneer in spiritual matters we consider his testimony of great value. Such as Boehme are the pioneers, the leaders of mankind in the quest of God, in the exploration of the unmapped realms of reality. Reality was seen to be perceivable by making ourselves more real, that is, by trying to raise the level of self, to widen self, to deepen self and to open the eyes of self, but as was seen before, this was to be accomplished, paradoxically, by making oneself selfless and surrendering one's will to God. Only by losing himself did Boehme

find himself, all his finding and seeing being in Christ, with whom he more and more merged as his life deepened, thereby filling the ominous gap between the phenomenal and noumenon to his entire satisfaction. In this sort of life we see a new measurement of truth such as we also find in the perfection of a great poem, in nature at her best, or in the character of a Socrates. We likewise see in this sort of life a form of "logic of coherence" for Boehme finds in his mystical and highest experience a new coherence of things in the universe. In fact only in these highest experiences is revealed to Boehme and the other mystics the coherence of the world and when they saw the coherence of the world, they saw it as it is. Reality obeys this higher logic, the logic of coherence, the logic of beauty or the logic of a perfect life.

This logic of the whole personality or logic coherence provides at least a partial solution to the knowing process. It is in the total relationship of things that the knowing process can really begin. Without such self-transcendence, reflection and the knowing process cannot begin. Without some sort of ability to stand off from oneself, to see things in their larger interrelations, reflection and the knowing process simply go around in a circle and cannot really start. Without the logic of coherence or logic of the whole, the facts of our experience are contradictory and we saw that in Boehme there was the avoiding of this contradictriness and of an infinite regress or circle in the thinking process by the finding of a completion and fruition of his mystical experiences and living in a personified Absolute or God. For him all things were *known* and *had* in Christ, the end of all things.

The fact that Boehme and others had the hunger and need for such a unifying life factor, indicates to the minds of many that such a unifying element does exist. With the finding of this peace, knowing and unification with his God and Christ, Boehme feels that the treasure of treasures is found. In this unification and merging of self with his God, nothing of self or of individuality was really lost, but a greater and finer self emerged from the old Boehme. In this greater and finer self we saw a new aesthetic, ethical and pragmatic verification, secure in a logic of coherence and of the whole personality.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 1

[1] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 10.
[2] Lehmann, Dr. E., *Mysticism in Heathendom and Christendom.*
[3] Sharpe, A. B., *Mysticism: Its True Nature and Value*, p. 82.
[4] Cousin quoted by W. R. Inge in Appendix of *Christian Mysticism.*
[5] Ewald, quoted by W. R. Inge in Appendix of *Christian Mysticism.*
[6] Jowett, quoted by W. R. Inge in Appendix of *Christian Mysticism.*
[7] Jones, Rufus M., *Studies in Mystical Religion*, p. XV.
[8] Seth, Professor A., quoted by W. R. Inge in *Christian Mysticism*, p. 339.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] Von Hartmann, quoted by W. R. Inge in *Christian Mysticism*, p. 339.
[11] Bonchitte, quoted by W. R. Inge in *Christian Mysticism*, pp. 336–7.
[12] Leuba, J. H., *Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, pp. 244–5.
[13] James, William, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, pp. 380–381.
[14] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 96.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 107.
[16] Russell, Bertrand, *Mysticism and Logic*, p. 5.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[20] Royce, Josiah, *The World and the Individual*, p. 144, Vol. II.
[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 148–9.
[22] Schelling, quoted by Thomas Arming Hall, *Essays on Modern Theology*, p. 260.
[23] Hall, T. A., *Ibid.*, p. 261.
[24] Hall, T. A., *Ibid.*, p. 262.
[25] Riley, Woodbridge, *The Meaning of Mysticism*, p. 78.
[26] Hall, T. A., *Essays on Modern Theology*, p. 264.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 267.
[28] Boehme, Jacob, *Mysterium Magnum*, Chap. 58, Sec. 10, Vol. 5, p. 475, Schiebler edition.

"Wie wir dessen ein gewaltig Exempel an Jakob haben, welcher musste 20 Jahre dienstbar sein als ein Knecht, bis durch ihn die 12 Stämme Israels gezeuget worden; anzudeuten, dass ein Christ müsse unter dem dienstbaren Joche der verderbten, selbherrschenden, eigenwilligen adamischen Natur geboren werden; soll er aber als ein Christ aus Christi Linea geboren werden, so muss sich der Gebärer zum Knechte Gottes begeben, und im Reiche der Natur nur als ein Diener Gottes sein, welcher in seinem Herzen alles Zeitliche verlässet, und nichts fur eigen achtet, sondern sich in seinem Stande nur als einen Diener achtet, der seinem Herrn darinnen dienet."

[29] Boehme, Jacob, *Mysterium Magnum*, Chap. 66, Secs. 1, 2, 3, (Parts), Vol. 5, pp. 562–3, Schiebler edition.

"Die gar schöne Figur von Joseph: wie er sei dem Potiphar verkaufet worden; was sich mit Joseph habe zugetragen, und von der Keuschheit und Gottesfurcht Josephs . . . Die Historia präfiguriret uns einen wahren Christenmenschen, wie er sei, und was er in der Welt sei, auch was sein Amt sei, das ist, wenn Christus in ihm offenbar wird, so ist er nicht mehr sein eigen, dass er thue, was er wolle, auch hat er in dieser Welt nichts mehr zum Eigenthum, das er kann mit Wahrheit sagen: Mein, oder Ich, Ich bins, Ich hab' es, es ist mein eigen, ich mag darmit thun, was meinem Fleische und eigenem Willen lustert; ichs mags brauchen zu meinen Ehren und Wollust, dass ich dadurch in der Welt hoch sei. Nein, das alles hat ein rechter Christ nicht in Gewalt.

"Denn er herrschet wohl in dem mit Rechte, das er mit Rechte und Wahrheit hat und besitzet, aber nur als ein Diener seines Herrn Christi. Denn ein Christ ist ein Christ in Christo, und ist zum christlichen Leben und zum

Gehorsam des Glaubens durch das Blut Christi um Christi 30 Silberlinge erkaufet worden, davon hat ihm sein Herr Christus Josephs 20 Silberlinge eingethan, und ihm darüber zum Verwalter gesetzet, dass er soll damit werden, bis dass er auch 30 Silberlinge daraus mache, die soll er zum Mahlzeichen seines Herrn Christi in sich tragen, als einen Schatz seines Christenthums."

[30] Boehme, Jacob, *Mysterium Magnum*, Chap. 71, Secs. 42, 45, 46 and others, Vol. 5, pp. 621–633, Schiebler edition.

(42) "Wenn ein Mensch also, wie oben gemeldet, ein wahrer Christ wird, dass ihm Gott seine Gnade giebet, so leget er ihm seine Gnade verborgentlich in seinen Sack des Leibes, in des Lebens Essenz, und leget ihm darzu den Kreuzbecher Christi, und schuldiget ihn nun nicht mehr im Gewissen, wegen seiner vielfältigen begangenen Sünden, denn er hat sie mit der Gnadenvergebung getilget, und ihm seine Gnade in den Sack seiner Sünden eingefüllet für seinen Hunger der armen Seele; aber er beschuldiget ihn nun des Bechers Christi, dass er an demselben schuldig sei, als an Christi Spott, Leiden und Tod, dass er hat Christum mit seinen Sünden ans Kreuz gebracht, dass er nunmehr des Kreuzbechers Christi schuldig sei, und gar nicht gerecht sei."

(45) "Aber Gottes Gerechtigkeit, welche den Menschen nun in Process Christi fodert, als in Christi Leiden und Tod, und ihn aber in seinem Wandel und Willen nicht allemal darinnen findet, die schilt ihn für einen Dieb, welcher Christi Kreuzbecher nur als ein Dieb im Sacke seines Lebens Essenz träget, und fodert von ihm den Diebstahl, so er anders wandelt als im Process Christi."

(46) Denn Christus hat die Menschen in sein Leiden und Tod eingenommen, und der Gerechtigkeit des Zorns Gottes entwandt, und sie mit ihrem schuldigen ewigen Tode in seinen unschuldigen Tod eingeführet, und ist ihrer Sünde und Bosheit in ihm selber abgestorben; und in diesem Absterben Christi fodert nun Gottes Gerechtigkeit im Zorn einen Christenmenschen."

[31] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Chap. 2, Sec. 6, p. 14 of Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

"Weil mir denn durch Suchen und Anklopfen ist meine Erkenntniss worden, schreibe ich es zu einem Memorial, ob ich Einen möchte lüsternd machen nachzusuchen, damit mein Pfund möchte wuchern und nicht in der Erde verborgen liegen. Aber den Vorhin—Klugen, welche Alles und doch auch nichts begreifen und wissen, denen habe ich nichts geschrieben—denn sie sind vorhinsatt und reich—sondern den Einfältigen wie ich bin, damit ich mich möchte mit meines Gleichen ergössen."

[32] Boehme, Jacob, *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen*, Chap. 14, Secs. 1 and 2, p. 211 of Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

"Lieben Kinder Gottes, lasset uns doch herzlich und ganz inniglich betrachten, von wannen wir sind, oder wo wir hin wollen; und dann, was wir thun und vorhaben, damit wir doch nicht das ewige und höchste Gut verlieren.

"Was trachten wir doch also nach zeitlicher Wollust, nach Ehren, Geld und Gut; sind wir doch allhier in diesem Leben nur fremde Gäste und dazu Pilgersleute, die alle Stunden müssen warten, wenn sich dieses Leben endet. Sind wir doch nicht zur Wollust dieses Lebens geschaffen worden, sondern zur paradeisischen Freude und zu einem einfältigen Kinderleben. Wir sollten von keiner Pracht und Hochmuth wissen; sondern als die Kinder bei einander leben in einem Freudenspiel. Wir sind ausgegangen aus unsrer rechten reinen paradeisischen Mutter, darinnen wir sollten in ihr als liebe Kinder leben; . . ."

[33] Boehme, Jacob, *Der Weg zu Christo*, (Das vierte Büchlein—Von wahrer Gelassenheit, Chap. 1, Secs. 1 and 2, p. 77 of Vol. 1, Schiebler edition.

"Ein wahres Exempel haben wir am Lucifer und auch an Adam, dem ersten Menschen, was die Selbheit thut, wenn sie das Licht der Natur zum Eigenthum bekommet, dass sie im Verstande mag in eigenem Regiment wandeln.

Auch siehet man es an den kunstgelehrten Menschen, wenn sie das Licht der äussern Welt oder der Natur in ein vernünftig Eigenthum erlangen, wie daraus nichts als eigene Hoffart enstehet. Welches doch alle Welt so heftig suchet und begehret, als den besten Schatz; es ist auch wohl der beste Schatz dieser Welt, so er recht gebrauchet wird."

"Weil laber die Selbheit, als die Vernunft, in einem schweren Gefängniss, als in Gottes Zorn, sowohl auch in der Irdigkeit gefangen und fest angebunden stehet: so ist es dem Menschen gar gefährlich, dass er das Licht der Erkenntniss in der Selbheit führe als ein Eigenthum der Selbheit."

[34] *Ibid.*, Sec. 24, p. 82.

"Kein Dichten in göttlichen Sachen oder menschlichem Grunde soll sich die eigene Vernunft vornehmen, auch nichts wollen oder begehren, als nur Gottes Gnade in Christo allein, auf Art, wie sich ein Kind nur stets nach der Mutter Brüsten sehnet: also soll der Hunger nur stets in Gottes Liebe eingehen und sich ja mit nichten von solchem Hunger abbrechen lassen. Wenn die äussere Vernunft im Lichte triumphiret und spricht: ich habe das wahre Kind; so soll sie Wille der Begierde zur Erde beugen, und in die höchste Demuth und albernen Unverstand einführen und zu ihr sagen: Du bist närrisch und hast nichts, als nur Gottes Gnade; du musst dich in dieselbe mit grosser Demuth einwinden und ganz in dir zu nichte werden, dich auch weder, dich auch weder kennen noch lieben; Alles, was an und in dir ist, muss sich nichtig, nur blos ein Werkzeug Gottes achten und halten, und die Begierde allein in Gottes Erbarmen einführen, und von allem selbsteigenen Wissen und Wollen ausgehen, es auch Alles für nichtig halten und keinen Willen schöpfen, jemals in nahe oder ferne darein wieder einzugehen."

[35] This idea is mentioned many times by Boehme especially in *Der Weg zu Christo*. It is the basic essential of his method.

[36] Martensen, H. L., *Life and Teaching of Jacob Boehme*, p. 107.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[38] Boehme, Jacob, *Epistolae Theosophicae, oder Theosophische Sendbriefe—Der zwölfte Sendbrief an Herrn Caspar Lindnern*—Especially secs. 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 20, pp. 399 to 413 of Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

"Denn ich sahe und erkannte das Wesen aller Wesen, den Grund und Ungrund; item, die Geburt der h. Dreifaltigkeit, das Herkommen und den Urstand dieser Welt und aller Kreaturen, durch die göttliche Weisheit. Ich erkannte und sah in mir selber alle drei Welten, als 1—die göttliche englische oder paradiesische; und dann 2—die finstere Welt, als den Urstand der Natur zum Feuer; und zum 3—diese äussere sichtbare Welt, als ein Geschöpf und Ausgeburt, oder als ein ausgesprochen Wesen aus den beiden inneren geistlichen Welten. Ich sahe und erkannte das ganze Wesen in Bösem and Gutem, wie eines von dem andern urständete, und wie die Mutter der Gebärerin ware, dass ich micht nicht allein hoch wunderte, sondern auch erfreuete.

"Und fiel mir zu hand also stark in mein Gemüth, mir solches für ein Memorial aufzuschreiben: wiewohl ich es in meinem äussern Menschen gar schwer ergreifen und in die Feder bringen konnte. Ich musste gleich aufangen, in dieser sehr grossen Geheimniss zu arbeiten, als ein Kind, das zur Schule gehet. Im Inneren sahe ich es wohl, als in einer grossen Tiefe, denn ich sahe hindurch als in ein Chaos, da Alles inne lieget; aber seine Auswickelung war mich unmöglich.

"Es eröffnete sich aber von Zeit zu Zeit in mir, als in einem Gewächse: wiewohl ich 12 Jahre damit umging, und dessen in mir schwanger war, und einen heftigen Trieb in mir befand, ehe ich es konnte in das Aeussere bringen; bis es mich hernach überfiel als ein Plassregen: was der trifft, das trifft er. Also ging es mir auch, was ich konnte ergreifen, in das Aeussere zu bringen, das schrieb ich auf.

"Wiewohl mir die Sonne nachmals ziemliche zeit geschienen hat, aber nicht immer beharrlich. Wenn sich diese hat verborgen, so habe ich wohl

auch meine eigene Arbeit kaum verstanden, und solches darum, auf dass der Mensch erkenne, dass das Wissen nicht sein, sondern Gottes sei, dass Gott in der Seele, des Menschen wisse, was und wie er will." . . .

. . . "Denn ich habe ihn viel hundertmal geflehet, so mein Wissen nicht zu seinen Ehren und meinen Brüdern nicht zur Besserung möchte dienen, er wollte solches von mir nehmen, und mich nur in seiner Liebe erhalten; aber ich habe befunden, dass ich mit meinem Flehen nur habe das Feuer in mir heftiger entzündet und in solchem Entzünden und Erkenntniss habe ich meine Schriften gemacht" . . .

"Es soll Keiner höher von mir halten, als er hier siehet; denn das Werk in meiner Arbeit ist nicht mein, ich habe es nur nach dem Maass, als mir es vom Herrn vergönnet wird: ich bin nur sein Werkzeug, mit dem er thut, was er will. Solches melde ich Euch, mein geliebter Herr, zur Nachricht, dass nicht Jemand einen Andern bei mir suche, der ich nicht bin, als Einen von Kunst und hoher Vernunft; sondern ich lebe in Schwachheit und Kindheit, in der Einfalt Christi, in seinem mir gegebenen Kinderwerke darinnen habe ich mein Spiel, und ist mein Zeitvertreiben, darinnen habe ich meine Freude, als in einem Lustgarten, da viel edle Blumen innen stehen: mit denen will ich mich dieweil ergössen, bis ich werde wiederum die Paradiesblumen, im neuen Menschen erlangen."

[39] *Ibid.*

[40] D'Aygalliers, A. Wautier, *Ruysbroeck the Admirable*, pp. 184–5.

[41] *Ibid*, p. 182.

[42] Knight, Rachel, *The Founder of Quakerism*, p. 33.

[43] Royce, Josiah, *The World and the Individual*, Vol. 1, pp. 79–81.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[45] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 158.

[46] Récéjac, E., *Essai sur les Fondements de la Connaissance Mystic*, p. 50.

[47] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 204.

[48] Boehme, Jacob, *Aurora, oder Morgenröthe im Aufgang*, Chaps. 7 and 10, pp. 59–67 and 92–103 in Vol. 2 of Schiebler edition.

[49] Pratt, J. B., *The Religious Consciousness*, p. 435.

[50] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 207.

[51] Boehme, Jacob, *Schlüssel—(The Clavis)—Vorrede*, Par. 2, p. 657 of Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

"Will Einer den göttlichen Grund, als die göttliche Offenbarung forschen, so soll er sich zuvorhin bedenken, zu was Ende er solches begehre zu wissen; ob er auch dasjenige, was er möchte erlangen, begehre zu practiciren, und zu Gottes Ehre und seines Nächsten Wohlfahrt anzulegen; ob er auch dadurch begehret der Irdigkeit und eigenem Willen abzusterben und in dem, das er sucht und begehret, zu leben, und Ein Geist mit ihm zu werden."

[52] Boehme, Jacob, *Der Weg zu Christo—Von wahrer Gelassenheit*, Chap. 2, Secs. 32 and 33, p. 93 of Vol. 1, Schiebler edition.

"Darum sage ich, alles Dichten zu Gott, wie das auch immer einen Namen haben mag, darin der Mensch Wege zu Gott möge dichten, ist ein vergeblich unnütz Ding, ausser dem neuen Gemüthe. . . . Kein anderer Weg ist zu Gott, als ein neu Gemüth, das sich von der Bosheit abwendet und in Reue seiner begangenen Sünden einwendet, von der Uebelthat ausgehet und der nicht mehr will, sondern seinen Willen in Christi Tod einwindet, und der Sünde der Seele mit Ernste in Christi Tod abstirbet, dass das seelische Gemüth der Sünden nicht mehr will. Ob alle Teufel hinter ihm her wären und ins Fleisch mit ihrer Begierde einführen; so muss der Seele Wille im Tode Christi stille stehen, sich vergergen und nichts wollen als nur Gottes Barmherzigkeit."

[53] *Ibid.*, pp. 93–4, Secs. 34, 36, 7.

"Kein Heucheln und äusserlich Trösten hilft nichts, da man den Schalk der Sünde im Fleische mit Christi Bezahlung wollte zudecken und in der Selbheit stehen bleiben.—Es ist kein Heucheln noch Wort—Vergeben; nicht

von aussen angenommene Kinder müssen wir sein, sondern von innen, aus Gott geborene Kinder, in einem neuen Menschen, der in Gott gelassen ist. Alles Heucheln, dass wir sagen, Christus hat bezahlet und für die Sünde genuggethan, er ist für unsere Sünde gestorben, so wir nicht auch der Sünde in ihm sterben und sein Verdienst in einem neuen Gehorsam anziehen und darinnen leben, ist alles falsch und ein nichtig ungültig Trösten."

[54] *Ibid.*, Sec. 40, pp. 94–5.

"Denn so das Auge der Seele licht ist, so ist der ganze Leib in allen Gliedern licht. So sich nun Einer der Kindschaft rühmet, und lässet den Leib in Sünden brennen, der ist der Kindschaft noch nicht recht fähig, oder lieget ja in Banden des Teufels, in einer schweren Finsterniss gefangen. Und so er auch nicht den ernsten Willen zur Wohlthat in der Liebe in sich brennen findet, so ist sein Vorgeben nur ein Vernunft-Dichten aus der Selbheit, welche nicht mag Gott sehauen, sie werde denn neu geboren und erzeige sich in der Kraft der Kindschaft; denn kein Feuer ist ohne Licht. So nun Gottes Feuer im Gemüthe ist, so wird's wohl hervorleuchten und das thun, was Gott haben will."

[55] *Ibid.*, Sec. 46, pp. 95–6.

". . . Es muss ernstes Beten mit grosser Demuth und mit der eigenen Vernunft eine Weile ein Narr sein, sich selbst darinnen thöricht sehen, bis Christus eine Gestalt in dieser neuen Menschwerdung bekommt."

[56] Boehme, Jacob, *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen*, Chap. 1, Sec. 48, p. 14 of Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

"Forschet nach der Schrift Herzen und Geiste, dass er in euch geboren werde, und euch das Centrum der gottlichen Liebe aufgeschlossen werde, so möget ihr Gott erkennen, und recht von ihm reden; denn aus der Historie soll sich keiner einen Meister, Erkenner und Wisser des göttlichen Wesens nennen, sondern aus dem h. Geiste, welcher in einem andern Principio erscheinet im Centro des Menschen Lebens, und dem rechten ernstlichen Sucher erscheinet; wie uns denn Christus bei seinem Vater; als im Centro des Lebens, mit rechter ernster begehrender Demuth heisset anklopfen und suchen, so werden wir finden."

NOTE: The inner meaning of the scriptures is the theme of the entire *Mysterium Magnum.*

[57] Boehme, Jacob, *Aurora, oder Morgenröthe im Aufgang, Vorrede*, pp. 1–20 of Volume 2, Schiebler edition.

[58] Inge, W. R., *Christian Mysticism*, p. 9.

[59] Boehme, Jacob, *Der Weg zu Christo*, sixth book, *Vom übersinnlichen Leben* (*Ist ein Gespräch eines Meisters und Jüngers*), pp. 130–151, Vol. 1 of Schiebler edition.

"Der Jünger sprach zum Meister: Wie mag ich kommen zu dem übersinnlichen Leben, dass ich Gott sehe und höre reden?

"Der Meister sprach: Wenn du dich magst einen Augenblick in das schwingen, da keine Kreature wohnet: so hörest du, was Gott redet.

"Der Jünger sprach: Ist das nahe oder ferne?

"Der Meister sprach: Es ist in dir, und so du magst eine Stunde schweigen von allem deinen Wollen und Sinnen: so wirst du unaussprechliche Worte Gottes hören.

"Der Jünger sprach: Wie mag ich hören, so ich von Sinnen und Wollen stille stehe?

"Der Meister sprach: Wenn du von Sinnen und Willen deiner Selbheit stille stehest, so wird in dir das ewige Hören, Sehen und Sprechen offenbar und höret und siehet Gott durch dich. Dein eigen Hören, Wollen und Sehen verhindert dich, dass du Gott nicht siehest noch hörest.

"Der Jünger sprach: Womit soll ich Gott hören und sehen, so er über Natur und Kreatur ist?

"Der Meister sprach: Wenn du stille schweigest, so bist du das, was Gott von Natur und Kreatur war, daraus er deine Natur und Kreature machte; so

hörest und siehest du es mit dem, damit Gott in dir sah und hörete, ehe dein eigen Wollen, Sehen und Hören anfing.

"Der Jünger sprach: Was hält mich denn auf, dass ich nicht dahin kommen mag?

"Der Meister sprach: Dein eigen Wollen, Hören und Sehen, und dass du wider das strebest, daraus du kommen bist. Mit deinem eigenen Wollen brichst du dich von Gottes Wollen ab, und mit deinem eigenen Sehen siehest du nur in dein Wollen. Und dein Wollen verstopfet dir das Gehör mit Eigensinnlichkeit irdischer, natürlicher Dinge, und führet dich in einen Grund ein, und überschattet dich mit dem, das du willst, auf dass du nicht magst zu dem Uebernatürlichen, Uebersinnlichen kommen.

"Der Jünger sprach: So ich in Natur stehe, wie mag ich aber durch die Natur in den übersinnlichen Grund kommen, ohne Zerbrechung der Natur?

"Der Meister sprach: Dazu gehören drei Dinge. Das erste ist, dass du deinen Willen Gott ergebest und dich zu Grund in seine Barmherzigkeit ersenkest. Das andere ist, dass du deinen eigenen Willen hassest, und nicht thuest, wozu dich dein Wille treibet. Das dritte ist, dass du dich dem Kreuze unterwerfest, auf dass du Anfechtung der Natur und Kreatur entragen mögest. Und so du das thust, so wird dir Gott einsprechen und deinen gelassenen Willen in sich, in den übernatürlichen Grund einführen, so wirst du hören, was der Herr in dir redet . . ."

NOTES ON CHAPTER II

[1] Vol. 6 of Schiebler edition of *Sämmtliche Werke*, pp. 1–143.

"Verfasset von Dr. Balthasar Walthern, Liebhabern der grossen Geheimnisse, und aus tiefem Grunde göttlicher Erkenntniss durch den gottseligen und hocherleuchteten deutschen Theosophum beantwortet im Jahre 1620. Dabei am Ende gefüget ist: Das ungewandte Auge, von der Seele und ihrer Bildniss."

"Psychologiae Supplementum—Das umgewandte Auge, welches handelt: von der Seele und ihrer Bildniss, und dann von der Turba, welche die Bildniss zerstöret (Ist ein Anhang zur ersten Frage)", pp. 144–148.

[2] This warning repeated 53 times in "Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen." Also referred to in most other works. Vol. 4, pp. 1–268 of Schiebler edition.

[3] Epistolae Theosophical, oder: Theosophische Sendbriefe—Der zehnte Sendbrief—Sec. 45, p. 397 of Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

"Und ob ich wohl könnte etwas zierlicher und verständiger schreiben, so ist diess die Ursache, dass das brennende Feuer öfters zu geschwinde treibet: dem muss die Hand und Feder nacheilen; denn es gehet als ein Platzregen, was er trifft, das trifft es. Wäre es möglich, Alles zu ergreifen und zu schreiben, so würde es wohl dreimal mehr und tiefer gegründet; aber es kann nicht sein: und darum werden mehr als Ein Buch gemacht, mehr als Eine Philosophie, und immer tiefer, also dass dasjenige, was in Einer nicht hat mögen ergriffen werden, in der andern gefunden werde."

[4] *Libri apologetici oder Schutzschriften—Apologia II contra Balthasar Tilken*, Sec. 297, p. 132 of Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

"Ich trage in meinem Wissen nicht erst Buchstaben zusammen aus vielen Büchern; sondern ich habe den Buchstaben in mir: liegt doch Himmel und Erde mit allem Wesen, dazu Gott selber, im Menschen. Soll er denn in dem Buche nicht dürfen lesen, das er selber ist."

[5] *Ibid.*, Secs. 72–75, pp. 100–101.

"Wenn ich nun rede von dritten Principio, so verstehe ich die äussere Welt; so spricht mein Gegensntz, Gott hat sie durch seine Weisheit gemacht, und bewähret's mit der Schrift. Und ich sage auch also; ich fahre aber nicht stumm, ich sage, woraus; denn Gott hat mir das Wissen gegeben: nicht ich, der ich der Ich bin, weiss es, sondern Gott weiss es in mir.

"Die Weisheit ist seine Braut, und die Kinder Christi sind in Christo in der Weisheit auch Gottes Braut. So nun Christi Geist in Christi Kindern wohnet, und Christi Kinder Reben am Weinstocke Christi sind, und mit ihm Ein Leib sind, auch Ein Geist: wem ist nun das Wissen? Ist's mein oder Gottes? Sollte ich denn nun nicht im Geiste Christi wissen, woraus diese Welt sei geschaffen, so derselbe in mit wohnet, der sie geschaffen hat? sollte Er's nicht wissen?

"So leide ich nun, und will nichts wissen, der ich der Ich bin, als ein Theil von der äussern Welt, auf dass er in mir wisse, was er wolle. Ich bin nicht die Gebärerin im Wissen, sondern mein Geist ist sein Weib, in der er das Wissen gebieret, nach dem Maass als er will.

"Gleichwie die ewige Weisheit Gottes Leib ist, und er gebieret darinnen, was er will. So er nun gebieret, so thue nicht ich's, sondern er in mir; ich bin als todt im Gebären der hohen Wissenheit, und er ist mein Leben: hab' ich's doch weder gesucht noch gelernet. Er neiget sich zu meiner Ichheit, und meine Ichheit neiget sich in ihn."

[6] *De Incarnatione Verbi, oder: Von der Menschwerdung Christi—Zweiter Theil*, Chap. 7, Par. 3, p. 276 of Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

". . . Sagte doch Christus: Des Menschen Sohn thut nichts, als was er siehet den Vater thun, das thut er auch. So ist doch des Menschen Sohn unser Haus worden, in das wir sind eingegangen, er ist unser Leib worden, und sein Geist ist unser Geist. Sollen wir in Christo denn in Gott blind sein?

Der Geist Christi siehet durch und in uns was er will, und was er will, das sehen und wissen wir in ihm, und ausser ihm wissen wir nichts von Gott. Er thut göttliche Werke, und siehet was und wann er will, nicht wenn Adam will; wenn Adam gerne wollte seine Bosheit (mit Hochmuth sich sehen zu lassen) ausschütten: o nein, da verbirget er sich, und siehet nicht in uns ins Freudenlicht in Gott; sondern ins Kreuz in Trübsal, in Christi Leiden und Sterben, Verfolgung und Schmach, in grosse Traurigkeit, dahinein siehet er, und lässet den alten Esel zappeln und Christi Kreuz tragen, das ist sein Amt. Aber auf dem Wege durch den Tod Christi siehet der neue Mensch in die englische Welt: sie ist ihm leichter und heller zu begreifen, als die irdische Welt, es geschiebet natürlich, nicht mit Einbildung; sondern mit sehenden Augen, mit denen Augen, welche die englische Welt sollen besitzen, als mit der Seele Bildniss Augen, mit dem Geiste, der aus der Seele Feuer ausgehet: derselbe Geist siehet in den Himmel, der schauet Gott und die Ewigkeit, und kein anderer, der ist auch das edle Bild nach Gottes Gleichniss."

[7] Nordau, M., *Degeneration*, p. 45.
[8] Leuba, James H., *Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, p. 315.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 314–5.
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 35–6.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 59.
[15] Hamilton, C. H., *Psychological Interpretation of Mysticism*, p. 9.
[16] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Vol. 3, Chap. 10, Sec. 26, pp. 88–89, Schiebler edition.

"Weil's an diesem Orte viel Fragen giebt (denn des Menschen Gemüth forschet wieder nach seinem Vaterlande, daraus es ist gewandert, und begehret wieder heim zur ewigen Ruhe) und mir in meiner Erkenntniss solches zugelassen ist; so will ich den tiefen Grund vom Fall setzen, da man dem Mosi kann in die Augen sehen, bist du aber aus Gott geboren, so ist dir's wohl begreiflich; aber kein unerleuchtet Gemüth begreift den Zweck. Denn das Gemüth muss im selben Hause sein, will's sehen, was im Hause ist; denn vom Hörensagen und nicht Selbersehen, ist immer Zweifel, ob die Dinge wahr sind, so man höret sagen: was aber die Augen siehet und das Gemüth erkennet, das glaubt's vollkommen, denn es hat's ergriffen."

[17] *Ibid.*, Chap. 8, Sec. 37, p. 68.

"Die Glossen, so über dem Mose aus der Vernunft gesetzt sind, werden dir's Paradeis nicht zeigen, vielweniger den Schöpfer. Der Prophet und Apostel hat in der Paradeis—Schule in einer Stunde mehr gelernet, als der Doctor in seiner Schule in dreissig Jahren. Es liegt nicht am eigenen Witz; wem Gott will, dem giebt er's umsonst; es ist um kein Geld oder Gunst zu kaufe, das wird dir König Salomon sagen. . . ."

[18] Hamilton, C. H., *Psychological Interpretation of Mysticism*, pp. 82–3.
[19] Delacroix, Henri, *Études sur le Mysticisme*, p. 62.
[20] Coe, G. A., *The Sources of Mystical Revelation*, *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1908, pp. 363 and 367.
[21] Hocking, W. E., *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, p. 391.
[22] Leuba, J. H., *Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, pp. 116–7.
[23] Patrick, G. T. White, *The World and Its Meaning*, p. 172.
[24] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 163.
[25] *Saturday Review*, London, May 9, 1925.
[26] DeSanctis, Sante, *Religious Conversion*, p. 217.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 312, also Kielholz, A. "Jacob Boehme; ein pathographischer Beitrag zur Psychologie der Mystik": Schriften zur angewandlten Seelenkunde xvii, Vienna, 1919.

[28] Cutten, George Barton, *The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity*, p. 443.
[29] Pfister, Oskar, *Some Applications of Psycho-Analysis*, p. 314.
[30] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, pp. 319–320.
[31] Jones, Rufus M., *Studies in Mystical Religion*, pp. xxvi–xxvii.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. xxix.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. xxxiii.
[34] Jones, Rufus, M., *New Studies in Mystical Religions*, pp. 9–10.
[35] Moses, Josiah, *Pathological Aspects of Religions*, p. 260.
[36] Jones, Rufus M., *New Studies in Mystical Religions*, p. 15.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III

[1] Jones, R. M., *Studies in Mystical Religion*, p. XVII.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 4.
[4] Inge, W. R., *Christian Mysticism*, p. 164.
[5] *World Tomorrow*, "Intelligence is Not Enough," August, 1927.
[6] *Ibid.*, "New Roads to Happiness," July, 1922.
[7] Gordon, C., "Has Mysticism a Moral Value?", *International Journal of Ethics*, October, 1920.
[8] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, 5th Chap., Sec. 4, pp. 40–41, Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

"Nun findest du ja hiergegen, wenn sie im Lichte Gottes neugeboren wird, wie die Schrift durchaus zeuget, und der neugeborne Mensch selber erfähret, dass die Seele gar ein demüthiges, sanftes, liebliches, wonnesames Wesen sei, die alles Kreuz und Verfolgung duldet, die dem Leibe wehret des ungöttlichen Weges, die keine Schmach von Teufeln und Menschen achtet, die ihr Vertrauen, Zuversicht und Liebe ins Herze Gottes setzet, die gar freudenreich ist, die vom Worte Gottes gespeiset wird, in welcher ein paradeisisch Lachen und Triumph ist, die der Teufel nicht berühren kann; denn sie ist in ihrer eigenen Substanz, mit welcher sie kreatürlich im ersten Principio im unauflöslichen Bande stehet, mit dem Lichte Gottes erleuchtet, un der heilige Geist (welcher aus der ewigen Geburt des Vaters im Herzen und Licht des Herzens Gottes augehet) der gehet auch in ihr aus und bestätiget sie zu Gottes Kinde."

[9] Boehme, Jacob, *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen*, Chap. 10, Sec. 49, pp. 150–151 of Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

"Darum lehret uns Christus Demuth, Liebe, Reinigkeit des Herzens, barmherzig sein, (Matth. 5, 1–5) und heisset uns Gottes Willens such und uns darein ergeben. Denn in Gottes Willen vermögen wir alles; nicht unsere eigene Natur soll es thun, sondern Gott eröffnet selber in uns, und er ist unser Thun, so wir etwas Wunder wirken: denn keine Menschenseele soll sagen oder denken: ich will Wunder thun, nein, das kann auch nicht sein."

[10] Boehme, Jacob, *De Incarnatione verbi, oder: Von der Menschwerdung Jesu Christi*. This is the theme of the third section entitled "Der Baum des Christlichen Glaubens; Ein rechter Unterricht, wie der Mensch könne ein Geist mit Gott sein, und was er thun müsse, dass er Gottes Werk wirke, u. s. w."—pp. 296 to 323 of Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.
[11] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Chap. 9, Sec. 1, p. 71, Vol. 3, of Schiebler edition.

"Kein Geld noch Gut, weder Kunst noch Macht wird dich bringen zur ewigen Ruhe der ewigen Sanftmuth des Paradeises, allein die edle Erkenntniss; darein kannst du deine Seele wickeln: das ist die Perle, die keine Motte frisst, und kein Dieb stiehlet; darum suche die, so findest du einen edelen Schatz."

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 81, Secs. 46–47.

"Darum such die edle Perle, sie ist viel köstlicher denn diese Welt: sie wird nimmermehr von dir weichen; und wo die Perle ist, da wird auch dein Herz sein; du darfest weiter allhier nicht nach Paradeis, Freude und Wonne des Himmels fragen. Suche nur die Perle: wenn du die findest, so findest du Paradeis und Himmelreich, und wirst so gelehrt, dass du es ausser diesem nicht glaubest.

"Du möchtest dich vielleicht ängsten und dieses in der Kunst suchen, vermeinend, allda zu finden: o nein! du darfst nicht, es stecket nicht darinnen."

[13] Boehme, Jacob, *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen—(De Triplici Vita Hominis)*, Chap. 1, Secs. 17–18 and on, p. 8 of Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

"Und befinden wir hierinnen unserer Seele erschrecklichen grossen Fall unserer erstern Eltern, dass sie ist in Geist dieser Welt eingegangen in eine fremde Herberge, und hat verlassen das göttliche Licht, darinnen sie ein

Engel und Kind Gottes war. Darum muss sie wieder ausgehen, aus dem Geiste der Sterne und Elemente in eine neue Geburt ins Leben Gottes.

"Weil aber dasselbe der Seele nicht möglich war, so kam das Leben Gottes aus Liebe und Gnaden zu uns in Fleisch, und nahm unsere menschliche Seele wieder in sich, in das göttliche Leben, in des Lichtes Kraft, dass wir allhier können in demselben Leben zu Gott in eine neue Geburt eindringen."

[14] *Ibid.*, Chap. 12—(especially section 2 which is quoted), pp. 183–184.

"Des Seelengeistes Wille ist ewig: was in des Seelengeistes Willen eingefasset wird, das nimmt die Seele mit, wenn sich Leib und Seele scheidet. Darum ist uns noth, dass wir nach etwas Gutes trachten, darinn die Seele könne ihr ewig Spiel verbringen, und darinnen sie ihre Freude habe, denn unserer Seele Werke folgen uns nach, und der Hände und des äussern Geistes Werke bleiben in dieser Welt: denn die Seele ist in der Ewigkeit; was sie ihr allhier machet und einbildet, das stehet immer vor ihr, es sei denn, dass sie das wieder zerbreche, so ist es als ein zerbrochen Werk, daran sie kein Suchen mehr verbringet; dann sie ist davon ausgegangen. Denn das Ewig schnitzet ein ewig Modell, und das Zerbrechliche und Anfängliche schnitzet ein zerbrechlich Modell; denn es werden alle Dinge dieser zeit ein jedes in seinem Modell stehen; denn was der ewige Wille fasset, das krieget eine unzerbrechliche Gestalt, so er das nicht selber zerbricht."

[15] *Ibid.*, Chap. 18, Sec. 30; Chap. 6, Sec. 33; Chap. 10, Sec. 8.

[16] James, William, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, pp. 422–3.

[17] James, Wm., *The Will to Believe*, p. XII.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 65.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

[29] James, Wm., *Pragmatism*, pp. 75–6.

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 200–201.

[31] Many additional references might be given to illustrate the full meaning and scope of the pragmatic aspects of Boehme's mystical philosophy. A few are given below:

Epistolae Theosophicae—Der zwölfte Sendbrief, Secs. 44–45, p. 407, Vol. 7 of Schiebler edition. (Writing of the mystic's trust, peace and joy.)

"Ein wahrer Christ hat mit Niemand Streit; denn er stirbet in der Gelassenheit in Christo allem Streit ab. Er sorget nicht mehr für den Weg zu Gott, sondern er ergiebet sich in die Mutter, als in Christi Geist; was der immer mit ihm machet, das gilt ihm gleich. Es sei in dieser Welt Glück oder Unglück, Leben oder Tod, es ist ihm Alles gleich. Es rühret den neuen Menschen kein Unglück, sondern nur den alten von dieser Welt, da mag die Welt mit ihm thun, was sie will; derselbe ist der Welt, aber der neue ist Gottes.

"Mein geliebter Herr; dieses is mein Weg, darauf ich wandele, und darauf ich wissen muss ohne mein Vorwissen: ich nehme mir keinen Fürsatz zuvorhin, was ich schreiben oder reden will, sondern ergebe mich in Gottes Wissen, der mag in mir wissen, was er will, und auf solchem Wege habe ich eine Perle erlanget, welche mir lieber ist, als die äussere Welt. . . ."

We again see the happiness of his life, his "healthy-mindedness," and appreciation of the simple beauty of nature.

Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens, Chap. 8, especially section 12 which is quoted, p. 62 of third Volume, Schiebler edition.

"Da siehet man das Gleichniss der paradersischen Welt gar schön; denn obgleich vieltausenderlei Kräuter in einer Wiese neben einander stehen und eines je kraftiger und schöner ist als das andere, noch missgönnet keines dem andern seine Gestalt, sondern ist eine liebliche Wonne in einer Mutter; also ist auch ein Unterscheid im Paradeise, da eine jede Kreatur nur seine grosse Freude an des andern Kraft und Schöne hat: und ist die ewige Kraft und Weisheit Gottes ohne Zahl und Ende, wie du vorne im dritten Kapital von Aufschliessung der Centrorum des ewigen Lebens findest. Du wirst kein Buch finden, da du die göttliche Weisheit könntest mehr inne finden zu forschen, als wenn du auf eine grüne und blühende Wiese gehest: da wirst du die wunderliche Kraft Gottes sehen, riechen und schmecken, wiewohl es nur ein Gleichniss ist; und ist die göttliche Kraft im dritten Principio materialisch worden, und hat sich Gott im Gleichniss offenbaret: aber dem Suchenden ist's ein liber Lehrmeistér, er findet gar viel allda."

In his "Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen" we find constant reference to the fact that he has tried the mystic life and found it one of real worth and joy. "The author speaks of his knowledge"—"The author speaks by living experience"—"The author speaks what he himself has tried"—"The author writes that which he has seen with spiritual eyes"—Chap. 6, Secs. 35 and 73, Chap. 9, Sec. 38; Chap. 13, Sec. 63; Chap. 14, Sec. 55; Chap. 16, Sec. 10.

Enough material from Jacob Boehme has been presented to show that his thinking involves the three basic assumptions in philosophizing presented by W. E. Hocking. (*Philosophical Review*, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 140–155). According to Hocking these assumptions are:

1. Things have a meaning.
2. Human beings can grasp that meaning or some of it.
3. It is worth while to do so and ought to be attempted.

"The mystic—the metaphysical mystic—reports that he has perceived a worth in being which outpasses our prudent imaginations; and if among the many mystics there is one true observer, we dare not attempt to measure the meaning of things from the psychological end, condemning ourselves forever to a universe of compromised and middling worth."

Things certainly had a meaning for Boehme and a meaning which human beings could grasp and which was worth while to attempt to grasp. Things became meaningful for him in God through Christ under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. It would be of interest to quote from another pragmatist of another type, namely, John Dewey.

Dewey says, "Meaning is wider in scope as well as more precious in value than is truth, and philosophy is occupied with meaning rather than with truth. Making such a statement is dangerous; it is easily misconceived to signify that truth is of no great importance under any circumstances; while the fact is that truth is so infinitely important when it is important at all, namely, in records of events and descriptions of existences, that we extend its claim to regions where it has no jurisdiction. But even as respects truths, meaning is the wider category; truths are but one class of meanings, namely, those in which a claim to verifiability by their consequences is an intrinsic part of their meaning. Beyond this island of meanings which in their own nature are true or false lies the ocean of meanings to which truth and falsity are irrelevant. We do not inquire whether Greek civilization was true or false, but we are immensely concerned to penetrate its meaning. We may indeed ask for the truth of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' or Shelley's 'Skylark', but by truth we now signify something quite different from that of scientific statement and historical record."

(Dewey, John, *The Role of Philosophy in the History of Civilization*, Sixth International Congress of Philosophy, 1926, pp. 536–542. Edited by E. S. Brightman.)

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV

[1] We see something of the importance of the doctrine of the microcosm in his mind in *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens—Vorrede*, Sec. 17, p. 7 of Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

"Darum ist dem Menschen in dieser Welt, alldiewiel er in diesem elenden, verderbten Fleischhause lebet in so grosser Gefahr, nicht nützlicher als das, dass er sich selber lerne recht kennen. Und so er sich nun recht kennet, so kennet er auch Gott, seinen Schöpfer, samt allen Kreaturen; auch (so erkennet er) wie Gott gegen ihn gesinnet sei. Und ist mir diese Erkenntniss die allerliebste, so ich jemalen erfunden habe."

[2] Boehme, Jacob, *Die zweite Schutzschrift wider Balthasar Tilken*, Sec. 140, p. 110 of Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

". . . . Weisst du aber auch, dass der Himmel wider die Hölle sei, und die Hölle wider den Himmel, der Zorn wider die Liebe, die Finsterniss wider das Licht? Was meinest du allhier von Gott? Wenn ich auf eure Weise soll reden, dass Got in allem alles mächtig ist, wie es denn wahr ist, so muss ich sagen, dass Gott Alles ist. Er ist Gott, er ist Himmel und Hölle, und ist auch die äussere Welt; denn von ihm und in ihm urständet alles. Was mache ich aber mit einer solchen Rede, die keine Religion ist? Eine solche Religion nahm der Teufel in sich, und wollte in allem offenbar sein und in allem mächtig."

[3] Boehme, Jacob, *Anti-Stiefelius II*, Sec. 316, p. 230 of Vol. 7 in Schiebler edition.

"Gottes Licht lässt sich nicht im Fleische fortsäen: der Moder zum Lichte wird wohl gesäet, aber in seinem Principio innestehend. Die äussere Welt ist nicht Gott, wird auch ewig nicht Gott genannt, sondern nur ein Wesen, darin sich Gott offenbaret, als ein Gleichniss des h. göttlichen himmlischen Wesens, in dem Gott wirket."

[4] *Ibid.*, Sec. 95, p. 183.

"Man muss allezeit die Menschheit und die Gottheit unterscheiden, und den menschlichen Willen von Gottes Willen. Denn kein Mensch kann Gottes Sinn und Willen in der Selbheit treffen; der Mensch siehet dem Geiste Gottes nach."

[5] Boehme, Jacob, *Aurora, oder Morgenröthe im Aufgang*, 3rd Chap., p. 34 of Volume 2 of Schiebler edition.

"Nicht musst du denken, dass Gott im Himmel und über dem Himmel etwa stehe und walle wie eine Kraft und Qualität, die keine Vernunft und Wissenschaft in sich habe, wie die Sonne; die läuft an ihrem Zirk herum und schüttet von sich die Hitze und das Licht, es bringe gleich der Erde und den Kreaturen Schaden oder Frommen, welches dann freilich geschähe, so die andern Planeten und Sterne nicht wehreten. Nein, so ist der Vater nicht, sondern ist ein allmächtiger, allweiser, allwissender, allsehender, allhörender, allriechender, allfühlender, allschmeckender Gott, der da ist in sich sänftig, freundlich, lieblich, barmherzig und freudenreich, ja die Freude selber."

[6] Boehme, Jacob, *De Signatura Rerum, oder von der Geburt und Bezeichnung aller Wesen*, Chap. 16 (Von der ewigen Signatur und himmlischen Freude, warum alle Dinge in Bös und Gut sind eingeführet worden) Sec. 1, pp. 452–3 of Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

"Die Schöpfung oder ganze Creation ist anders nichts als eine Offenbarung des allwesenden, ungründlichen Gottes: alles was er in seiner ewigen unanfänglichen Gebärung und Regiment ist, dessen ist auch die Schöpfung, aber nicht in der Allmacht und Kraft, sondern als ein Apfel auf dem Baum wächset, der ist nicht der Baum selber, sondern wächset aus Kraft des Baums. Also sind alle Dinge aus göttlicher Begierde entsprungen und in ein Wesen geschaffen worden, da am Anfange kein Wesen darzu vorhanden war, sondern nur dasselbe Mysterium der ewigen Gebärung, in welchem eine ewige Vollkommenheit ist gewesen."

[7] Boehme, Jacob, *De Incarnatione Verbi, oder: Von der Menschwerdung Christi—Erster Theil*, 2nd Chap. Sec. 5, pp. 158–159 of Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

"Und ist uns isst also zu entsinnen das Verbum *FIAT*, das sie gefasset und in eine Substanz und körperlich Wesen gebracht hat, denn der Wille zu dieser Bildniss ist aus dem Vater, aus des Vaters Eigenschaft im Worte oder Herzen Gottes von Ewigkeit entstanden, als sein begehrender Wille zur Kreatur und zur Offenbarung der Gottheit. Weil er sich aber von Ewigkiet nicht beweget hat, bis auf die Schöpfung der Engel, so ist auch keine Schöpfung geschehen bis zur Engel Schöpfung; dazu wir denn den Grund und Ursache nicht sollen wissen, und es Gott seiner Macht vorbehalten hat, wie es gewesen sei, dass sich Gott eines beweget hat, sintemal er doch ein unwandelbarer Gott ist; sollen auch allhier weiter nicht gründen, denn diess turbiret uns."

[8] Boehme, Jacob, *Psychologia Vera, oder: Vierzig Fragen von der Seele*, 1st Question, Sec. 273, p. 50 of Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

"Und da wir doch das Fiat kennen, und wissen, wie wir sind gemacht worden, so wissen wir doch nicht die erste Bewegung Gottes zur Schöpfung. Das Machen der Seele wissen wir wohl, aber wie das, welches in Ewigkeit ist in seinem Wesen gestanden, ist beweglich worden, wissen wir keinen Grund, denn es hat nichts, das er erreget hätte, und hat einen ewigen Willen, welcher ohne Anfang und unverändlich ist."

[9] Boehme, Jacob, *Theosophische Fragen, oder 177 Fragen von gottlicher Offenbarung*—Die 3rd Frage, Secs. 2, 3, 9 and 10, pp. 597–599, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

"Der Leser soll wissen, dass in Ja und Nein alle Dinge bestehen, es sei Göttlich, Teuflisch, Irdisch, oder was genannt mag warden. Das Eine, als das Ja, ist eitel Kraft und Leben, und ist die Wahrheit Gottes oder Gott selber. Dieser wäre in sich selber unerkenntlich, und wäre darinnen keine Freude oder Erheblichkeit, noch Empfindlichkeit ohne das Nein. Das Nein st ein Gegenwurf des Jah, oder der Wahrheit, auf dass die Wahrheit offenbar und Etwas sei, darinnen ein Contrarium sei, darinnen die ewige Liebe wirkend, empfindlich, wollend, und das zu lieben sei.

"Und können doch nicht sagen, dass das Jah vom Nein abgesondert, und zwei Dinge neben einander sind, sondern sie sind nur Ein Ding, scheiden sich aber selber in zwei Anfänge, und machen zwei Centra, da ein jedes in sich selber wirket und will. Gleichwie der Tag in der Nacht, und die Nacht in dem Tage zwei Centra sind, und doch ungeschieden, als nur mit Willen und Begierde sind sie geschieden. Denn sie haben zweierlei Feuere in sich, als 1) den Tag, das Hitzige aufschliessend, und 2) die Nacht, das Kalte einschliessend: und ist doch zusammen nur Ein Feuer, und wäre keines ohne das andere offenbar oder wirkend. Denn die Kälte ist der Wurzel der Hitze, und die Hitze ist die Ursache, dass die Kälte empfindlich sei. Ausser diesen beiden, welche doch in stetem Streite stehen, wären alle Dinge ein Nichts, und stünden stille ohne Bewegniss. . . . Dieser ausgeflossene Wille führet sich in Begierde, und die Begierde ist magnetisch, als einziehend, und die Einheit ist ausfliessend. Itzo ist's ein Contrarium, als Jah und Nein. Denn das Ausfliessen hat keinen Grund, aber das Einziehen machet Grund. Das Nichts will aus sich, dass es offenbar sei, und das Etwas will in sich, dass es im Nichts empfindlich sei, auf dass die Einheit in ihm empfindlich werde. So ist doch aus und ein eine Ungleichheit.

"Und heisset das Nein darum ein Nein, dass es eine eingekehrete Begierde ist, als Nein-wärts einschliessend. Und das Jah heisset darum Ja, dass es ein ewiger Ausgang und der Grund aller Wesen ist, als lauter Wahrheit. Denn es hat kein Nein vor ihm, sondern das Nein urständet erst in dem ausgeflossenen Willen der Annehmlichkeit."

Other references to same general idea:

a. *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Chap. 9, Secs. 30–48, pp. 77 to 82, Vol. 3 of Schiebler edition.

b. *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen*, Chap. 2, Secs. 85–94, pp. 30–32, Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

c. *Mysterium Magnum, oder Erklärung über das erste Buch Mosis*, Chap. 4, pp. 17–21, Vol. 5, Schiebler edition.

d. *Ibid.*, Chap. 40, pp. 305–322.

e. *De Signatura Rerum, oder von der Geburt und Bezeichnung aller Wesen*, Chap. 6, pp. 307–313, Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

f. *Psychologia Vera, oder, Vierzig Fragen von der Seele, ihrem Urstande, Essenz, Wesen, Natur und Eigenschaft, was sie von Ewigkeit in Ewigkeit sei*, Chap. 1, Secs. 62–105, especially pp. 16–24, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

[10] Boehme, Jacob, *Apologia II contra Balthas Tilken* (*Schutzschriften*), Sec. 141, p. 110, Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

"So sprichst du: So ist Gott mit ihm uneinig, weil er Böses und Gutes ist? O du liebe Vernunft, lerne das Centrum allhier, oder bleibe daheim mit Lehren und Schreiben. Siehe! ich sage dir ein solches: wenn keine Angst wäre, so wäre kein Feuer, und wenn kein Feuer wäre, so wäre kein Licht, und wenn kein Licht wäre, so wäre weder Natur noch Wesen, und wäre Gott ihm selber nicht offenbar. Was wäre denn nun? Ein Nichts! Wenn du wirst auf's Centrum kommen, so wirst du das sehen. Mit diesem gar hohen Artikul weise ich den Leser in das Buch von den sechs (theosophischen) Punkten der drei Welten; da wird er sehen, was Gott ist, und was sein Wille und Allmacht ist, und was Gott heisset."

It is interesting to note that Heraclitus two thousand years before the birth of Boehme pointed out that Homer was incorrect in saying that he wished strife might perish from among the gods and men, for, as Heraclitus pointed out, this was equivalent to praying for the destruction of the universe! Should this Homeric prayer for the ending of strife be answered all things would pass away.

[11] Boehme, Jacob, *Libri Apologetici oder Schutzschriften—Apologia I contra Balthas Tilken*, Chap. I, Secs. 102–104, pp. 16–17, Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

"Die Seele des Menschen ist aus dem Centro, das Gott vaters heisst; verstehe, aus der ewigen, unanfänglichen Natur. Sie hat das Centrum zum Feuer und Licht in sich, zum Bösen und Guten; was sie ihr erwählet, vom selbigen wird sie wieder erwählet und aufgenommen: welches an den Teufeln zu sehen ist.

"Sie waren Engel in Gottes Licht, und ihr Centrum bewegte sich noch höher, als der Englischen Naturrecht ist, und erweckten in ihnen die Mutter des Urstandes im Grimm; der fing auch alsobald ihren Willengeist, und erwählte sie zu Kreaturen der finstern Welt.

"Meinst du nun, es sei Gottes fürsützlicher Wille gewesen, so müsste Gott in sich einen Teufelswillen haben, und auch einen englischen. Das wäre ganz wider die Schrift der Heiligen, auch wider Gottes Liebe und wider das Licht der ewigen Natur."

[12] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Chap. 10, Secs. 23–25, p. 88, Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

". . . Oder warum liess er's zu, dass der Mensch ass von der Frucht, so er allwissend ist? Warum liess er denn Baum des Erkenntniss Böses und Gutes wachsen?

"Also richtet die Vernunft. Hätte Gott nicht gewollt, Adam hätte nicht also gegessen; oder hätte kein Gebot über diesen Baum allein gemacht, er muss ihn ja zum Anstoss gemacht haben. Also richtet eine Part. Die andere Vernunft will's besser machen, die ist ja etwas weiser und nicht viel, die spricht: Gott hat den Menschen versucht, ob er wolle in seinem Gehorsam leben, und als er Ungehorsam sei erfunden worden, habe Gott so einen mächtigen Zorn auf ihn geworfen, und ihn verflucht zum Tode, und sein Zorn

könne nicht gelöschet werden, er müsste also versöhnet werden. Diese Vernunft machet aus Gott eine eitele Unbarmherzigkeit, gleich einem bösen Menschen dieser Welt, der doch versöhnt wird, wann er sich hat einmal genug gerochen, und hat noch keine Wissenschaft von Gott und Paradeis.

"O liebe Seele! es ist gar ein Schweres, davon sich wohl möchte haben der Himmel entfärbet. In diesem Versuchen ist gar ein grosses in Mose verborgen, welches die unerleuchtete Seele nicht verstehet. Es war Gott nicht um einen Apfel—oder Birnenbiss zu thun, eine solche schöne Kreatur also zu strafen; die Strafe rührete nicht von seiner Hand, sondern (vom Geist majoris mundi) vom Gieste der grossen Welt, vom dritten Principio. Gott meinete es gar barmherzig mit dem Menschen; darum verschonete er seines Herzens nicht und liess es Mensch werden, dass er den Menschen wieder hülfe; du darfst nicht also denken. Gott ist die Liebe und das Gute, in ihm ist kein zorniger Gedanke, hätte sich oder Mensch nur selber nicht gestraft, wie du an seinem Orte lesen wirst."

[13] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Chap. 8, Sec. 2, p. 60, Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

"Ich will den Leser an die Geschöpfe gewiesen haben, er mag darinnen forschen: er wird es alles also befinden, und noch viel wunderlicher, das man nicht schreiben, oder reden kann, ist er aber aus Gott geboren. Wir müssen unsern Verstand und Wissenschaft nicht gründen von dem göttlichen Machen oder Schaffen, als wie ein Mensch etwas machte; gleichwie ein Töpfer aus Thon ein Gefäss, oder ein Schnitzer ein Bild wie ihm das gefällt, welches er zerbricht, so es ihm nicht gefällt: nein, die Werke Gottes in der Schöpfung der Welt sind alle fir, gut und vollkommen gewesen; wie Moses schreibet: Und Gott sah an alles, was er gemacht hatte, und siehe, es war sehr gut. (Gen. 1, 31)."

[14] *Ibid.*, Sec. 1.

"Wie im nähesten Kapitel im Eingange gemeldet worden, nichts Fremdes ist es, ob ein Mensch redet, schreibet und lehret von der Welt Schöpfung, ob er gleich nicht ist dabei gewesen, so er nur die wahre Erkenntniss im Geiste hat. Denn da siehet er, als in einem Spiegel, in der Mutter der Gebärerin alle Dinge; denn es liegt je ein Ding im andern, und je mehr er suchet, je mehr er findet; und darf sein Gemüthe nicht ausser dieser Welt schwingen, er findet alles in dieser Welt, darzu in sich selber, ja in allem dem, was lebet und webet. Alles, was er nur ansiehet und forschet, so findet er darinnen den Geist mit dem Fiat; und spiegeliret sich die göttliche Kraft in allen Dingen, wie geschrieben stehet: das Wort ist dir nahe, ja in deinen Lippen und Herzen. (Deut. 30, 14). Denn wenn das Licht Gottes im Centro des Seelen—Geistes anbricht, so siehet der Seelen—Geist, als in einem hellen Spiegel, die Schöpfung der Welt gar wohl, und ist nichts Fernes."

[15] Since the notion of opposites, highers and lowers will be referred to so constantly in Boehme some further aspects will be of great interest. W. E. Hocking writes, "Then, too, in a world in which everything is momentarily affecting everything else, nothing is functionless. The myriads of organisms in the early stages of evolution are not left behind by the highest, but are organized into its life-cycle. Humanity cannot be itself without animal, vegetable, micro-organism: thus the highest, by itself, is not so high as a union of the highest with the not-highest. The 'highest' in biology turns out to be a concept with a double boundry. It begins to appear to our slow political vision that the 'highest races' so far from rendering the less high superfluous are not so high as a possible just union of the 'highest' with the 'backward', The failure of aristocracy is in supposing that there is a class of 'the best'. a class with a single boundary which clearly excludes the not-best. And perhaps if there is a Highest Being, its boundary also will extend to include lower ranges of the scale. This is the clear sense of Augustine's remark: 'With a sounder judgment I apprehend that the things above were better

than the things below, but all together better than the things above by themselves'."

W. E. Hocking, *Philosophical Review*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 140 on.

In this connection we shall later see than in Boehme, God becomes conscious in man, God not being manifested without a lower.

[16] Boehme, Jacob, *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen*, Chap. 3, Sec. 21, p. 36, Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

"So aber desselbe ewige Wesen hat wollen offenbar sein, so hat es müssen einen Willen schöpfen, welcher begehrend ist; und da aber nichts war zu begehren als nur das kräftige Wort, und dasselbe doch auch in der stillen Ewigkeit nicht war, so mussten die sieben Gestalten der ewigen Natur erboren werden, welche sind die sieben Siegel des Sohnes Gottes, wie die Offenbarung Johannis zeuget: und daraus ist von Ewigkeit erboren worden des kräftige Wort, welches ist der stillen Ewigkeit Kraft, Herz und Leben, und seine Weisheit."

[17] Boehme, Jacob, *Schlüssel*, Part 9, p. 669, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

Erklärung der sieben Eigenschaften der ewigen Natur—

LOWER GROUP OR TRIANGLE

Principium Zorn	*Hollische Eigenschaften*	*Welt, mit Eigenschaften des ersten Principiums*
1. Herbe, Begierde, Wille	1. Hart, Kalt Geiz	1. Kalte, Harte, Bein, Salz
2. Bitter, Ziehen oder Stachel der Empfindlichkeit	2. Stachel, Neid	2. Gift, Leben, Wachsen, Sinne
3. Angst oder Gemüth	3. Feindschaft	3. Schwefel, Pein, Empfindlichkeit

(*Number four is connecting factor*)

4. Feuer oder Geist	Hoffart, Zorn 4. *oder Finster-Feuer* 4. Liebe-oder Licht-Feuer	4. Geist, Vernunft, Begierde

UPPER GROUP OR TRIANGLE

Principium Liebe	Himmlische Eigenschaften	Irdisch Reich, mit Eigenschaften beider Principien
5. Licht oder, Liebe, daraus das Wasser des ewigen Lebens fleusst	5. Sanftmuth	5. Venus-Spiel, Lebens-Licht

6. Schall oder Verstand	6. Göttliche Freude	6. Lauten, Schreien, Unterscheiden
7. Leib oder Wesen	7. Himmel	7. Leib, Holz, Steine, Erde, Metalle, Kraut

(Bemerkung. Nr. 1, 2, 3, wird auch genannt die Finster-Welt, Gleichniss am Stock einer Kerze; Nr. 4 die Feuerwelt, Gleichniss am Feuer einer Kerze; Nr. 5, 6, 7 die Licht-Welt, Gleichniss an dem Licht einer Kerze.)

Ibid., Part 8, Sec. 38.

"Die erste Eigenschaft ist die Begierlichkeit, gleich einem Magnet, als die Einfasslichkeit des Willens, da der Wille etwas sein will, und hat doch Nichts, daraus er ihm etwas mache; so führet er sich in eine Annehmlichkeit seiner selbst, impresset und fasset sich selber zu einem Etwas; und das Etwas ist doch nichts, als nur ein scharfer magnetischer Hunger, eine Herbigkeit, gleich einer Härte, davon auch Härte, Kälte und Wesen enstehet. Dieses Impressen oder Anziehen beschattet sich selber, und machet sich zur Finsterniss, welches auch der Grund der ewigen und zeitlichen Finsterniss ist. Durch diese Schärfe ist im Anfang dieser Welt enstanden Salz, Steine, Beine, und Alles, was dem gleichet."

Also reference to same matter in *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Chap. 7, pp. 51–59 of Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen, Chap. 2, pp. 16–32 of Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

[18] Boehme, Jacob, *Schlüssel*, part 8, Secs. 30 and 39, pp. 667 and 670 of Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

(30) "Die andere Eigenschaft ist die Bewegniss oder Einziehen der Begierde, die machet Stachen, Brechen und Scheidung der Härte; die zerscheidet die angezogene Begierde und bringet sie in Vielheit, und ist ein Grund des bittern Wehes, und auch die Wurzel zum Leben, und ist der Vulcanus zum Feueraufschlagen."

(39) "Die andere Eigenschaft der ewigen Natur enstehet aus der ersten, und ist das Ziehen oder Bewegen in der Schärfe, denn der Magnet machet Härte, und die Bewegung Zerbricht die Härte wieder, und ist ein immerwährender Streit in sich selber, denn was die Begierde fasset und zu Etwas machet, das zerscheidet die Bewegniss, das es in Form und Bildung kommet. Zwischen diesen beiden Eigenschaften entstehet das bittere Wehe, als ein Stachel der Empfindlichkeit: denn so eine Bewegniss in der Schärfe ist, so ist die Eigenschaft peinlich, und dieses ist auch die Ursache aller Empfindlichkeit und Wehethuns; denn so keine Schärfe und Bewegniss wäre, so wäre keine Empfindlichkeit."

Also many other references including:

a. Tafeln von den drei Principien göttlicher Offenbarung, u. s. w., Part I, Sec. 34, pp. 647–648, Vol. 6 of Schiebler edition.

b. Sex Puncta Theosophica—oder, Von sechs theosophischen Punkten, Part 1, Secs. 34–74, pp. 336 to 341, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

[19] Boehme, Jacob, *Ibid.*, Part 2, Secs. 1–55, pp. 342–350.

Also *Mysterium Magnum, oder Erklärung über das erste Buch Mosis*, Chap. 3, Secs. 15 and 16, pp. 14–15 of Vol. 5, Schiebler edition.

"Die Angstquaal wird also verstanden: die herbe Begierde die fasset sich, und zeucht sich in sich, und macht sich voll, hart und rauh; so ist das Ziehen ein Feind der Härte. Die Härte ist haltend, und das Ziehen ist fliehend; Eins will in sich, und das Andere will aus sich: so es aber nicht von einander weichen oder sich trennen kann, so wirds in einander gleich einem drehenden Rade; Eins will über sich, das Andere unter sich.

"Denn die Härte giebt Wesen und Gewicht, und der Stachel giebt Geist und das fliegende Leben: diess drehet sich mit einander in sich und aus sich, und kann doch nirgends hin. Was die Begierde, als der Magnet, hart macht, das zerbricht das Ziehen wieder, und ist die grösste Unruhe in sich selber, gleich einer wüthenden Unsinnigkeit, und ist in sich eine erschreckliche Angst, und wird allhier doch noch kein recht Fühlen verstanden bis zum Feuer; und bescheide den rechtverständigen Naturkündiger allhier, was das sei oder bedeute; er mag sich besinnen, in seinem natürlichen Wissen wird ers finden."

Schlüssel, Part 8, Sec. 47, p. 672, Schiebler edition, Vol. 6.

"Also verstehen wir mit der dritten Eigenschaft der Natur, also mit der Angst, die Schärfe und Peinlichkeit des Feuers, als das Brennen und Verzehren; denn so der Wille in solche Schärfe gesetzet wird, so will er immerdar die Ursache solcher Schärfe verzehren, denn er dringet immerdar wieder nach der Einheit Gottes, als nach der Ruhe, und die Einheit dringet mit ihrem Ausfluss zu dieser Bewegniss und Schärfe, und ist dasselbe also eine stetswährende Zusammenfügung zur Offenbarung göttliches Willens; wie man denn in diesen dreien, als im Salz, Schwefel und Oel allezeit ein Himmlisches findet in dem Irdischen, wer das recht verstehet, und dem Geist nachsinnet . . . "

[20] *Ibid.*, Secs. 48–57, pp. 672 to 674.

(48) "Die vierte Eigenschaft oder Gestalt der ewigen Natur ist das geistliche Feuer, darinnen das Licht, als die Einheit, offenbar wird; denn der Glanz des Feuers urständet von der augeflossenen Einheit, welche sich hat mit in die natürliche Begierde eingegeben; und des Feuers Quaal und Brennen, als die Hitze, urständet von der scharfen Verzehrlichkeit der drei ersten Eigenschaften . . . "

(50) "In diesem Blick empfindet die Einheit die Empfindlichkeit, und der Wille empfähet die sanfte Einheit: also wird die Einheit ein Glast der Feuers und das Feuer wird ein Liebebrennen; denn es empfähet Essenz oder Kraft von der sanften Einheit."

See also Boutroux, E., *Historical Studies in Philosophy*, p. 196.

[21] *Schlüssel*, Part 8, Secs. 58 to 68. pp. 674–676 of Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

(58) "Die fünfte Eigenschaft ist nun das Liebefeuer oder des Lichtes Kraft und Welt, welche in der Finsterniss in sich selber wohnet, und die Finsterniss begreifet sie nicht, wie Joh. 1, 5. stehet: Das Licht scheinet in der Finsterniss, und die Finsterniss haben's nicht begriffen. Item: Das Wort ist im Lichte, und im Wort ist das wahre, verständige Leben des Menschen, als der wahre Geist."

(61) "Mit dieser fünften Eigenschaft wird das andere Principium, als die englische Welt oder die Thronen verstanden; denn es ist die Bewegniss der Einheit, da alle Eigenschaften der feuerigen Natur in der Liebe brennen."

Other references:

a. De Incarnatione Verbi, oder: Von der Menschwerdung Christi-Zweiter Theil, 4th and 5th Chaps., pp. 254–268, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

b. De Signatura Rerum, oder von der Geburt und Bezeichung aller Wesen, Chap. 14 (especially section 22 on), Vol. 4, pp. 423–440, Schiebler edition.

[22] Boehme, Jacob, *Tafeln von den drei Principien göttlicher Offenbarung*, Part 1, Sec. 48, p. 650 of Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

"Die sechste Eigenschaft Nr. 6 ist das Verständniss, als der Hall oder Schall, da die Eigenschaften im Lichte alle in der Gleichheit stehen, so freuen sie sich, so wird die Kraft der fünf Sensuum (Sinne) lautbar, und freuen sich alle Eigenschaften in einander, je eine der andern, und also führet sich die Liebe der Einheit in Wirken und Wollen, in Empfindniss, Findniss und Hochheit. Und also ist ein Contrarium in der ewigen Natur, auf dass Eigenschaften urständen, darinnen die Leibe erkannt werde, und dass etwas sei, das zu lieben sei, darinnen die ewige Liebe der Einheit Gottes zu wirken

habe, darinnen das Lob Gottes geschehe. Denn so des Lebens Eigenschaften mit göttlicher Liebesflamme durchdrungen werden, so loben sie die grosse Liebe Gottes, und ergeben sich alle wieder in die Einheit Gottes. Solch Freuen und Erkenntniss möchte in der Einheit nicht offenbar werden, so sich nicht der ewige Wille in peinliche, bewegliche Eigenschaften einführete."

[23] Boehme, Jacob, *Mysterium Magnum, oder Erklärung über das erste Buch Mosis*, Chap. 5, Sec. 11, p. 24, Vol. 5, Schiebler edition.

"Die sechste Gestalt der Natur und aller Wesen entstehet auch aus den andern allen, und wird im Feuer durchs Licht in der Liebe begierde offenbar; die ist der Natur Verstand, Schall, Rede und alles was lautet, es sei im Lebhaften oder Unlebhaften. Sein rechter Urstand ist von der herben Begierde oder Impression von der ersten, andern und dritten Gestalt, davon das Bewegen und die Härte enstehet. Im Feuer wird das Wesen der Coagulation verzehret, und gehet aus der Verzehrung ein solcher Geist aus, beides nach des Lichts in der Liebe Eigenschaft, und in der Finsterniss nach der feindlichen Qual und Angst Eigenschaft; und ist uns dieses also zu verstehen."

[24] *Ibid.*, Sec. 19, p. 25.

"Im Lichte Gottes, welches das Himmelreich heisst, ist der Schall alles ganz sanst, lieblich und subtil, gegen unserer äusserlichen Grobheit in unsern Schallen und Reden, auch Klange und Sange, gleichwie eine Stille, da das Gemüth in sich nur etwan als in einer Freudenreich spielete, und auf innerliche Art einen solchen lieblichen süssen Ton hörete, und äusserlich nicht hörte oder verstünde; denn in des Lichtes Essenz ist alles subtil, auf eine Art, gleichwie die Gedanken, in einander spielen, da doch wahrhaftig ein verständlich unterschiedlicher Ton und Rede im Reiche der Herrlichkeit gebrauchet und von den Engeln gehöret wird, aber nach ihrer Welt Eigenschaft."

[25] *Ibid.*, Chap. 6—(Das siebente Wesen)—pp. 26–31. Also: *Tafeln von den drei Principen göttlicher Offenbarung*, Part 1, Sec. 49, pp. 650–651, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

"Die siebente Eigenschaft Nr. 7. ist das Wesen, darinnen die andern alle wesentlich sind, darinnen sie alle wirken, wie die Seele im Leibe, darinnen man die Natur und auch die ewige wesentliche Weisheit Gottes, als das Mysterium Magnum, verstehet, aus welchem Grunde die sichtbare Welt mit ihrem Wesen und Kreaturen ist entsprossen."

Also: *Aurora, oder Morgenröthe im Aufgang*, Chap. 11, Sec. 1, p. 103, Vol. 2, Schiebler edition.

"Der siebente Geist Gottes in der göttlichen Kraft ist der Körper, der aus den andern sechs Geistern begoren wird, darinnen alle himmlische Figuren bestehen, und darin sich Alles bildet und formet, und darin alle Schönheit und Freude aufgehet. Das ist der rechte Geist der Natur, ja die Natur selber, darin die Begreiflichkeit stehet, und darin alle Kreaturen formirt sind im Himmel und auf Erden: ja der Himmel selber ist darin formirt und alle Natürlichkeit in dem ganzen Gott stehet in diesem Geiste. So dieser Geist nicht wäre, so wäre auch kein Engel noch Mensch und wäre Gott ein unerforschliches Wesen, welches nur in unerforschlicher Kraft bestände."

[26] *Ibid.*, Chap. 16, pp. 177–192—(part of page 178 quoted).

"Die siebente Gestalt oder der siebente Geist in der göttlichen Kraft ist die Natur, oder der Ausgang aus den andern sechsen. Denn die herbe Qualität zieht den Salniter oder die Wirkung aller sechs Geister zusammen, gleichwie ein Magnet des Eisens Salniter an sich zieht; und wenn es nun zusammengezogen ist, so ist's eine Begreiflichkeit, in welcher die sechs Geister Gottes unbegreiflicher Weise qualifiziren.

"Dieser siebente Geist hat eine Farbe und Art wie alle Geister, denn er ist aller Geister Leib, darinnen sie sich gebären, als in einem Körper. Auch so werden aus diesem Geiste alle Figuren und Formen gebildet, dazu sind auch die Engel daraus geschaffen, und alle Natürlichkeit stehet darin.

"Dieser Geist wird immer von allen sechs geboren und bestehet immerdar

und vergehet kein Mal, hinweider gebäret immer wieder die sechs; denn die andern sechs sind in diesem siebenten wie in einer Mutter umschlossen, und nehmen ihre Nahrung, Stärke und Kraft immer in ihrer Mutter Leibe. Denn der siebente ist der Leib und die andern sechs sind das Leben, und im mittlern Centrum ist das Herz des Lichts, welches die sieben Geister als ein Licht des Lebens immer gebären; und dasselbe Licht ist ihr Sohn, und die wallende Beweglichkeit oder Durchdringung durch alle Geister empöret sich im Herzen im Aufgange des Lichts."

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

"Der Leib des Engels oder die Begreiflichkeit ist aus dem siebenten Geiste, und die Geburt in demselben Leibe sind die sechs Quellgeister und der Geist oder das Herz, den die sechs Geister im mittlern Centrum des Leibes gebären, darin das Licht aufgehet und aus dem Licht der animalische Geist, welcher auch ausserhalb des Körpers mit der Gottheit inqualiret, das bedeutet das Herz Gottes, aus welchem der heilige Geist ausgehet."

[28] *Ibid.*, Chap. 19, p. 215.

"Darum ist ein fester Schluss zwischen der äussersten Geburt des obern Himmels und dieser Welt, denn die Veste zwischen ihnen ist der Tod, der herrschet an allen Enden in der äussersten Geburt in dieser Welt; und damit ist diese Welt verriegelt, dass die äusserste Geburt des obern Himmels nicht in die äusserste Geburt dieser Welt kann; es ist eine grosse Kluft zwischen ihnen.

"Und darum können wir die Engel in unsrer äussersten Geburt nicht sehen und die Engel können auch nicht in der äussersten Geburt dieser Welt bei uns wohnen, in der innersten aber wohnen sie bei uns. Und so wir mit dem Teufel kämpfen, so halten sie seine Schläge in der innersten Geburt auf und sind der heiligen Seelen Schutz. Darum können wir die Engel nicht sehen, oder begreifen, denn die äusserste Geburt ihrer Leiber ist der äussersten Geburt dieser Welt unbegreiflich."

[29] Boehme, Jacob, *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen*, Chap. 14, Sec. 43, p. 226, Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

"Also wisset, dass der Teufel öfters mit den Engeln streitet. Wenn die Seele des Menschen sicher ist, so will er mit Macht hinzu, aber er wird aufgehalten, dass er dasjenige, was er will, nicht thun kann; aber sobald die Seele imaginiret und die Lust fänget, so sieget der Teufel. Wenn die Seele aber die böse Lust wegwirft, so wird er vom Engel vertrieben, und ist ein steter Streit um die Seele des Menschen: Gott will sie haben, so will sie der Teufel auch haben; und das ist die Ursache des Streits, dass sich zwei Reiche auf dem Kreuze scheiden: Eines ist Gottes Liebe, das Reich im Ternario Sancto, als das englische; und das andere ist der Grimm aus dem Centro Natura, welcher Gottes Zorn und Schärfe ist."

[30] Boehme, Jacob, *Sex Puncta Theosophica, oder: Von sechs theosophischen Punkten hohe und tiefe Grundung*, Chap. 5, Sec. 18—(also 6th Chapter)—pp. 364 to 367, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

(Section 18 quoted:)

"Obwohl Gottes Feuer die Wurzel ist, so gehöret sie doch nicht zu Gottes Reich. Und in diesem verstehet man auch, wie der Teufel die ärmste Kreatur ist, denn er mag nicht ein Läublein regen, es sei denn der Zorn darinne, so reget er das nach des Zorns Eigenschaft; denn das Licht und die Kraft dieser Welt ist ihm zuwider, er gehet mit seinem Willen nicht in des Lichts Eigenschaft, denn er kann auch nicht. Er stehet rückling gegen dem Lichte der Sonne, in seiner Figur und Eigenschaft; darum ist ihm das Sonnenlicht nichts nütze, und alles was in der Sonne Kraft, wächset, das sich der Sonne eineignet, das feindet er an; sein Wille gehet nicht gerne hinein."

[31] *Ibid.*, Chaps. 5 and 6, Der vierte Punkt, pp. 361–367.

We find similar ideas expressed in other works:

a. Schutzschriften—*Apologia I contra Balthasar Tilken*—Secs. 99–100, p. 16, Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

"Das Centrum, daraus Böses und Gutes quillet, ist in dir: was du in dir erweckest, es sei Feuer oder Licht, dasselbe wird wieder von seines Gleichen angenommen, entweder von Gottes Zornfeuer, oder von Gottes Lichtfeuer; ein jedes erwählet ihm seines Gleichen Eigenschaft.

"Will einer ein Teufel sehn, so will ihn Gottes Zorn haben, denn er ist seiner Eigenschaft, die Wahl ist bald da; will er aber ein Engel sein, so ist der Wähler auch bald da."

b. Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens—Vorrede—Par. 7, p. 3 of Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

"Denn es kann sich kein Mensch entschuldigen seiner Unwissenheit, sintemal Gottes Wille ist in unser Gemüth geschrieben, dass wir wohl wissen, was wir thun sollen. Es überzeugen uns auch alle Kreaturen; dazu haben wir Gottes Gesetz und Gebot, dass also keine Entschuldigung ist als unsre schläfrige, faule Nachlässigkeit, und werden als faule, unnütze Kneckte im Weinberg des Herrn erfunden."

[32] Boehme, Jacob, *Mysterium Magnum*, Chap. 9, Vom Fall Lucifers mit seinen Legionen, pp. 40–44, Vol. 5, Schiebler edition.

Also: Aurora, Chaps. 13 and 14, Vol. 2, pp. 135 to 166, Schiebler edition.

Chapter 13—Von dem schrecklichen, kläglichen und elenden Falle des Königreiches Lucifers.

Chapter 14—Wie Lucifer, der schönste Engel im Himmel, der greulichste Teufel geworden ist.

[33] Boehme, Jacob, *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen*, Chap. 2, Secs, 53–54, p. 25 of Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

"Auch so fügen wir euch dieses gar ernstlich zu bedenken, dass Gott nicht eben eine Hölle und sonderliche Quaal habe geschaffen, da er wollte die Kreaturen, als Engel und Menschen inne plagen, sintemal er ist ein Gott, der nicht das Böse will, und solches selber verbeut, auch sein Herz darum lassen Mensch werden, dass er den Menschen aus der ewigen ängstlichen Quall hülfe; so ist uns ja recht zu bedenken die ernstliche Quall des Abgrundes, welche ewig ist.

"Darum sobald die Teufel aus dem Lichte Gottes ausgingen und wollten in der Feuersmacht uber die Sanftmuth des Herzens Gottes herrschen, so waren sie gleich zur Stunde und Augenblick in der Höllen Abgrunde, und wurden von demselben gehalten; denn es ward ihnen keine sonderliche Quaal gemacht, sondern sie bleiben ausser Gott in den vier Gestalten der ewigen Natur."

[34] Boehme, Jacob, *Der Weg zu Christo*, p. 73, Vol. 1, Schiebler edition; also, Matthew 7-7 to 12.

[35] Boehme, Jacob, *Mysterium Magnum*, Chap. 41, Secs. 54–55, 62–63 quoted, pp. 331–333, Vol. 5, Schiebler edition.

"Der einige göttliche Weg, da man Gott in seinem Worte, Wesen und Willen schauen mag, ist dieser, dass der Mensch in ihm selber einig werde, und in seinem eigenen Willen alles verlasse, was er selber ist und hat, es sei Gewalt, Macht, Ehre, Schönheit, Reichthum, Geld und Gut, Vater und Mutter, Bruder, Schwester, Weib und Kind, Leib, und Leben, und ihm selber ganz ein Nichts werde. Er muss alles übergeben, und ärmer werden als ein Vogel in der Luft, welcher doch ein Nest hat; der wahre Mensch soll keines haben, denn er soll von dieser Welt wegwander, dass er ihm selber nicht mehr in dieser Welt sei. Er muss der Welt Selbheit ein Nichts werden, denn das Wesen dieser Welt, das er zum Eigenthum besitzet, ist der Thurm zu Babel und der Antichrist, da man will ein eigener Gott sein, und mit diesem selbgemachten Gott auf dem Thurme in Himmel steigen, und sich zu Gott setzen. Dieses verstehet also.

"Es ist nicht gemeinet, dass einer soll aus dem Hause von Weibe, Kind und Geschwistern laufen und aus der Welt fliehen, oder sein Gut also verlassen, dass er nicht darinnen sein wollte; sondern den eigenen Willen, welcher

dieses alles für ein Eigenthum besitzet, den muss er todten und zu nichte machen.

"Und um dieser Selbheit und Unwürdigkeit willen hat Gott sein heiliges Angesicht von den Völkern gewendet gehabt, dass sie ihn haben durch ein dunkel Wort oder Schein müssen erkennen.

"Wer aber in diese ganze Gelassenheit (al. Verlassenheit) eingehet, der kommt in Christo zu göttlicher Beschaulichkeit, dass er Gott in ihm siehet, mit ihm redet, und Gott mit ihm; und verstehet was Gottes Wort, Wesen und Willen ist: dieser ist tüchtig zu lehren, und kein anderer, der lehret Gottes Wort aus ihm, denn Gott ist in seinem Bunde, dessen Diener er ist, offenbar worden, denn er will nichts, ohne was Gott durch ihn will."

See also:

a. Boehme, Jacob, *Psychologia Vera, oder: Vierzig Fragen von der Seele*—Die erste Frage, Secs. 28 to 40, pp. 10 to 12, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

b. Boehme, Jacob, *De Signatura Rerum, oder Von der Geburt und Bezeichnung aller Wesen*, Chap. 15, Secs. 30 to 52, pp. 446–452, Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

[36] Boehme, Jacob, *Der Weg zu Christo*—(Das vierte Büchlein) Von Wahrer Gelassenheit, Secs. 43–44, pp. 85–86, Vol. 1, Schiebler edition.

"Kein Werk ausser Gottes Willen mag Gottes Reich erreichen, es ist Alles nur ein unnützes Schnitzwerk, in der grossen Mühseligkeit der Menschen; denn nichts gefället Gott, ohne was er selber durch den Willen thut. Denn es ist nur ein einiger Gott, in dem Wesen aller Wesen, und Alles, was in demselben Wesen mit ihm arbeitet, das ist ein Geist in ihm.

"Was aber in seiner Selbheit in eigenem Willen wirket, das ist ausser seinem Regiment, in sich selber. Wohl ist's in seinem allmächtigen Regiment, mit welchem er alles Leben regieret; aber nicht in dem heiligen göttlichen Regiment in sich selber, sondern im Regiment der Natur, damit er Böses und Gutes regieret. Kein Ding wird göttlich geheissen, das nicht in Gottes Willen gehet und wirket."

[37] Fleming, W. K., *Mysticism in Christianity*, p. 106.

[38] Royce, Josiah, *The World and the Individual*, Vol. 1, pp. 85, 190–1.

[39] Fleming, W. K., *Mysticism in Christianity*, p. 18.

[40] Plotinus, *Enneads*, I–VI–9.

[41] I John 3–9.

[42] Fleming, W. K., *Mysticism in Christianity*, p. 43 (Writing of R. M. Jones).

[43] Boehme, Jacob, *Schutzschriften—Apologia I*, Sec. 33, p. 7, Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

"Denn der Geist des Lichtes übte meine Seele heftig, wie der unparteiische Leser darinnen sehen wird, wie sich der Geist hat geübet, und manch Ding gar oft erzählet, und je tiefer und klärer von einer Stufe zur andern; es war die rechte Leiter Jakob's da meine Seele aufstieg durch Gottes Willen, dem es also gefiel, mich also zu üben, und in die himmlische Schule in *Ternarium Sanctum* einzuführen."

[44] Watkins, E. I., *The Philosophy of Mysticism*, p. 25.

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] Inge, W. R., *Christian Mysticism*, p. 249.

[47] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 24.

[48] Eucken, Rudolph, *Der Sinn und Wert des Lebens*, p. 148.

[49] Récéjac, E., *Fondements de la Connaissance Mystique*, p. 74.

[50] Ladd, A. T., *Knowledge, Life, and Reality*, p. 423.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 429.

[52] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 89.

[53] Haldane, R. B., *The Pathway to Reality*, Gifford Lectures 1903.

[54] From a paper written in a Catholic Seminary—quoted by J. H. Leuba in *Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, p. 260.

[55] Boehme, Jacob, *Schutzschriften—Apologia I contra Balthasar Tilken*, Sec. 86, p. 14, Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

"Wir müssen unserm Seelenfeuer göttlich Holz geben, soll es in göttlicher Quaal brennen, und soll ein göttlich Licht daraus scheinen. Irdisch Holz giebt irdische Quaal, und ein Licht nach derselben Quaal: was ein Mensch in sich entzündet, das brennet in ihm."

NOTES ON CHAPTER V

Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 2 (Writing of Coventry Patmore).

[2] Watkins, E. I., *The Philosophy of Mysticism*, pp. 26–27.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Inge, W. R., *Christian Mysticism*, pp. 342–3 (Writing of Lasson).

[5] Fleming, W. K., *Mysticism in Christianity*, p. 123.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 15–16.

[7] *Ibid.*, 15–16. (St. Augustine—De Trin—VII 4–7).

[8] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*—Vorrede, Sec. 2, p. 1, Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

"Ja noch mehr höhere und grössere Erkenntniss hat ihm Gott gegeben, dass er kann allen Dingen in's Herz sehen, was für Essenz, Kraft und Eigenschaft sie haben, es sei gleich in Kreaturen, in Erden, Steinen, Bäumen, Kräutern, in allen bewegenden und unbewegenden Dingen, sowohl auch in Sternen und Elementen, dass er weiss, wess Wesens und Kraft sie sind, und wie in derselben Kraft alle natürliche Sinnlichkeit, Wachsen, Mehren und lebend Wesen stehet."

[9] Boehme, Jacob, *De Incarnatione Verbi, oder: Von der Menschwerdung Christi*—Zweiter Theil, Chap. 7, Sec. 9, pp. 227–8, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

"Also, ihr lieben Kinder Gottes, die ihr mit viel Thränen suchet, lasset's euch nur Ernst sein. Unser Sehen und Wissen ist in Gott; er offenbaret einem Jeden in dieser Welt so viel er will, als er weiss, dass ihm nützlich und gut ist. Denn der aus Gott siehet, der hat Gottes Werk zu treiben, er soll und muss das treiben, lehren, reden und thun, das er siehet; sonst wird ihm das Sehen genommen. Denn diese Welt ist Gottes Sehen nicht werth; aber um der Wunder und Offenbarung Gottes willen wird Manchem gegeben zu sehen, dass der Name Gottes der Welt offenbar werde, welches auch ein Zeugniss über alles gottloses Wesen sein wird, welche die Wahrheit in Lügen verkehren und verachten den h. Geist: denn wir sind nicht unser selber, sondern dem wir dienen in seinem Lichte. Wir wissen nichts von Gott: er selber Gott ist unser Wissen und Sehen. Wir sind ein Nichts, dass Er Alles in uns sei, wir sollen blind, taub und stumm sein, und kein Leben in uns wissen, dass Er unser Leben und Seele sei, und unser Werk sein sei. Unsere Zunge soll nicht sagen, so wir was Gutes gethan haben: Das haben wir gethan, sondern, das hat der Herr in uns gethan, sein Name sei hochgelobet! Aber was thut diese böse Welt itzo? So Einer sagte: das hat Gott in mir gethan! so es gleich gut ist, so spricht die Welt: Du Narr, du hast es gethan, Gott ist nicht in dir, du leugst! Also muss der Geist Gottes ihr Narr und Lügner sein. Was ist es denn, oder wer redet aus dem Lästermunde? Der Teufel, der ein Feind Gottes ist, dass er Gottes Werk zudecke, auf dass Gottes Geist nicht erkannt werde, und er Fürst dieser Welt bleibe bis ins Gericht."

[10] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Chap. 4, Secs. 26–31, pp. 29–30, Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

(26) "Also siehest du, dass allda ist eine ewige Wurzel die das giebt. Und ob du könntest Farben und Gewächs darein bringen, so kannst du doch den Ruch und Kraft nicht darein bringen, und findest, dass im Urkund des Ruchs und Geschmacks muss ein ander Principium sein, das der Stock nicht selber ist; denn diess Principium urkundet sich vom Lichte der Natur.

(27) "Nun siehe weiter ans das menschliche Leben! Du siehest, greifest und erkennest durch dein Anschauen nicht mehr als Fleisch und Blut; darmit bist du andern Thieren gleich. Zum andern findest du das Element Luft und Feuer, das in dir qualifiziret, und das ist nun ein thierisch Leben; denn ein jedes Thier hat das in sich, davon es Lust hat, sich zu füllen und wieder zu gebären, wie alle Kräuter Laub und Gras. Du findest aber, dass in diesem allen kein rechter Verstand ist; denn obgleich das Gestirn darinnen qualifiziert und ihm Sinne giebt, so sind's doch nur Sinne sich zu nähren und mehren, gleich allen Thieren.

(28) "Denn die Sterne sind selber stumm und haben keine Erkenntniss noch Fühlung. Allein ihr sämmtlich Gewirke machet im Wasser ein Quellen durch einander, und in der Tinctur des Gebluts ein Aufsteigen, Sehen, Fühlen, Hören und Schmecken. Nun denke, wovon kommt aber die Tinctur, darinnen das edle Leben aufgehet, dass aus Herbe, Bitter und Feuer Süsse wird? So wirst du ja keine andere Ursache finden als das Licht. Wovon kommt aber das Licht, dass es in einem finstern Körper scheinet? Willst du sagen: vom Glast der Sonne? Was scheinet denn in der Nacht und leitet dir deine Sinne und Verstand, dass du auch mit zugedrückten Augen siehest und weisst, was du thust? Da wirst du sagen: Das edle Gemüth führet mich. Ja, recht also; wo hat aber das Gemüth seinen Urkund? So sagest du: Die Sinne machen das Gemüth beweglich. Ist auch recht. Wovon kommen aber diese alle beide? Was ist ihre Geburt oder Herkommen? Warum ist's nicht auch in Thieren?

(29) "Mein lieber Leser, kannst du, hie schleuss auf und siehe in Leib, du wirst's nicht finden. Suche nun gleich in der Tiefe, suche in Steinen, suche in Elementum, suche in allen Kreaturen, in Kräutern, Bäumen, in Metallen; suche gleich im Himmel und auf Erden: du findest's nicht.

(30) "Nun sagest du: Wo muss ich denn suchen und finden? Lieber Leser, ich kann dir keinen Schlüssel dazu leihen; allein ich will dir weisen, wo du ihn findest: der lieget im Evangelisten Johanne, Kap. 3, 5 und heisset: Ihr müsset von Neuem geboren werden durch das Wasser und Heiligen Geist. Derselbe Geist ist der Schlüssel. Wenn du den kriegest, so nimm ihn und gehe vor das erste Principium, daraus diese Welt ist erschaffen samt allen Kreaturen, und schleuss auf die Erste Wurzel, daraus solche fichtliche und empfindliche Dinge sind worden.

(31) "So wirst du sagen: Das ist allein Gott und der ist ein Geist, und hat alle Dinge aus Nichts geschaffen. Ja, recht also; Er ist ein Geist, und vor unsern Augen ist er wie ein Nichts. So wir ihn nicht an der Schöpfung kenneten, wüssten wir nichts von ihm; wäre er nicht von Ewigkeit gewesen, so wäre auch nichts worden."

[11] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, pp. 4–5.

[12] Holmes, Edmond, The Mystic as Explorer, *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1928.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 427.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 428.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 429.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 432.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 437.

[18] Boehme, Jacob—*a. Mysterium Magnum*, Chap. 41, Secs. 54–63, pp. 331–333, Vol. 5, Schiebler edition.

b. Psychologia Vera, oder: Vierzig Fragen von der Seele—Die erste Frage, Secs. 36–40, p. 12, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

c. De Signatura Rerum, oder Von der Geburt und Bezeichnung aller Wesen, Chap. 15, Sec. 33, p. 447, Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

[19] Boehme, Jacob, *Psychologia Vera—Die sechsundzwanzigste Frage*, Sec. 5, p. 104, Vol. 6, Schiebler edition.

"Nun wohlan, weil wir in Christo Ein Leib sind, und haben alle Christi Geist, so sehen wir in Christo alle aus einem Geiste und haben seine Erkenntniss; denn er ist in uns Mensch geboren worden, und sind aller Heiligen Seelen unsere Glieder, alle aus Einer gezeugt, und haben Alle Einen Willen in Christo, in der rechten Schoos Abrahä."

[20] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 97.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[22] Boehme, Jacob, *Die drei Principien göttlichen Wesens*, Chap. 4, Secs. 8–9 (in part), p. 25, Vol. 3, Schiebler edition.

". . . Wo willst du Gott suchen? In der Tiefe über den Sternen? Da wirst du ihn nicht finden! Suche ihn in deinem Herzen, im Centro deiner

Lebensgeburt: Da wirst du ihn finden, wie Vater Adam und Mutter Heva thaten.

"Denn es stehet geschrieben: Ihr müsset von Neuem geboren werden, durch das Wasser und Geist: sonst werdet ihr das Reich Gottes nicht sehen. (Joh. 3, 5) Diese Geburt muss in dir geschehen; das Herz oder Sohn Gottes muss in deines Lebens Geburt aufgehen: alsdann ist der Heiland Christus dein getreuer Hirte und du bist in ihm und er in dir, und Alles, was er und sein Vater hat, ist dein, und Niemand wird dich aus seinen Händen reissen; sondern wie der Sohn (das ist des Vaters Herz) einig ist, also ist auch dein neuer Mensch im Vater und Sohne einig, Eine Kraft, Ein Licht, Ein Leben, Ein ewig Paradies, Eine ewige himmlische Geburt, Ein Vater, Sohn, heiliger Geist und du sein Kind . . ."

[23] Haldane, R. B., *Meaning of Reality*, p. 8.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 8–9.

[25] *Ibid.* pp. 35–36.

[6] Bosanquet, Bernard, *The Principle of Individuality and Value.* (He is, of course, not using the phrase in connection with Boehme).

[27] James, William, *A Pluralistic Universe*, p. 155.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

[29] Inge, W. R., *Christian Mysticism*, pp. 19–21.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[31] Dawkins, M. B., *Mysticism an Epistemological Problem*, p. 25.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[35] Boehme, Jacob, *Vom dreifachen Leben des Menschen*, Chap. 1, Secs. 4 to 15, pp. 5–8, Vol. 4, Schiebler edition.

[36] Bradley, F. H., *Appearance and Reality*, p. 136.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

[38] Kingsland, Wm., *Rational Mysticism*, pp. 174–175.

[39] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 47.

[40] Royce, Josiah, *The World and the Individual*, Vol. 2, p. 386.

[41] Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 143.

[42] Compare with W. R. Inge, *Personal Idealism and Mysticism.*

[43] Boehme, Jacob, Informatorium II—Novissimorum. Oder: Unterricht von den letzten Zeiten, pp. 348–361, Vol. 7, Schiebler edition.

Also: Eleventh Epistle 1–3, p. 398.

Part quoted from page 123 of reprint of 1649 translation, Phila., 1897.

[44] Boehme, Jacob, *Der Weg zu Christo*—Das sechste Büchlein—Vom übersinnlichen Leben, pp. 130–152, Vol. 1, Schiebler edition.

(Page 149). "Christus wohnet wesentlich in dem Glauben derer, die sich ihm ganz ergeben, und giebt ihnen sein Fleisch zur Speise und sein Blut zum Trank, und besitzt also den Grund ihres Glaubens nach der Inwendigkeit des Menschen; darum denn ein Christ eine Rebe an seinem Weinstocke und ein Christ genannt wird, dass Christus geistlich in ihm wohnet. Und was man nun einem solchen Christen in seinen leiblichen Nöthen thur, das thut man Christo selber, welcher in ihm wohnet. Denn ein solcher Christ ist nicht sein eigen, sondern ist Christo ganz ergeben und sein Eigenthum; darum so geschieht es Christo selber . . ."

[45] *Ibid.*—Quoted from pages 254–5 from reprint Law's translation—Everyman's Edition—*Of the Supersensual Life.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, George P., *Mystical Element in Hegel's Early Theological Writings*, U. of California, 1910, Vol. 2.

Arseniew, Nicholas, *Mysticism and the Eastern Church*—Translated from the German by Arthur Chambers, London, 1926.

Bailey, M. L., *Milton and Jacob Boehme*, New York, 1914.

Balmforth, Henry, *Is Christian Experience an Illusion*, London, 1923.

Barry, F. R., *Christianity and Psychology*, New York.

Behmen, Jacob, *Complete Works Translated by William Law*, four volumes, London, 1763.

Behmen, Jacob, *Important Truths, A Translation of Selected Works*, London, 1769.

Boehme, Jacob, *The Signature of All Things* (And other works) (Reprint of Law's translation), New York, 1926.

Boehme, Jacob, *The Three Principles of the Divine Essence*, Chicago, 1909.

Behmen, Jacob, *Compendious View of Teutonick Philosophy*, London, 1770.

Behme, Jacob, *Works Englished by John Sparrow*, London, 1662.

Boehme, Jacob, *Epistles Reprint of 1649*, London Edition, Philadelphia, 1897.

Böhme, Jakob, *Sämmtliche Werke*, Seven Volumes edited by K. W. Schiebler, Leipzig, 1841–1860.

Boutroux, E., *Histoire de la Philosophie*. Translated New York, 1925. (Section on Boehme).

Bosanquet, Bernard, *The Principle of Individuality and Value*, Gifford Lectures for 1911.

Bradley, F. H., *Appearance and Reality*, London, 1893.

Burr, Anna Robeson, *Religious Confessions and Confessants*, New York, 1914.

Coe, George Albert, *The Sources of Mystical Revelation*, *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1908.

Cutten, George Barton, *The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity*, New York, 1909.

Dawkins, M. B., *Mysticism, an Epistemological Problem*, Yale, Ph.D., 1916.

D'Aygalliers, A. Wautier, *Ruysbroeck the Admirable*, N. Y., 1925. (Translated from the French.)

Delacroix, Henri, *Études d'Histoire et de Psychologie du Mysticisme*, Paris, 1908.

Devine, Rev. Arthur, *A Manual of Mystical Theology*, London, 1925.

DeSanctis, Sante, *Religious Conversion*. Translated from the French by H. Augur, N. Y., 1927.

Dresser, H. W., *Outlines of the Psychology of Religion*, N. Y., 1929.

Du Prel, Charles, *Philosophy of Mysticism*. Translation from the German by C. C. Massey, 2 Volumes, London, 1889.

Engelbrecht, H. S., *Intelligence is Not Enough, World Tomorrow*, August, 1927.
Eucken, Rudolph, *Der Sinn und Wert des Lebens*, Leipzig, 1910.
Fleming, W. K., *Mysticism in Christianity*, New York, 1913.
Gibbons, Daniel, *God in Us*, New York, 1928.
Gordon, R. M., *Has Mysticism a Moral Value? Int. J. of Ethics*, October 1920.
Hadfield, J. A., *Psychology and Morals*, New York, 1926.
Haldane, Richard Burdon, *The Pathway to Reality*, Gifford Lectures, 1903.
Hall, Thomas Arming, *Definition of Mysticism*, Essays in Modern Theology, New York, 1928.
Hamilton, Clarence Herbert, *Psychological Interpretation of Mysticism*, U. of Chicago, 1916.
Hartmann, Franz, *Life and Doctrines of Jacob Boehme*, Boston, 1891.
Hocking, William Ernest, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, Yale Press, 1912.
Hocking, William Ernest, *Meaning of Mysticism as Seen Through Its Psychology*, Mind, 1912, p. 43.
Hocking, William Ernest, *Human Nature and Its Remaking*, Yale Press, 1918.
Holme, E., *Mystic as Explorer, Hibbert Journal*, April, 1928.
Hügel, Baron Friedrich von, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, 2 volumes, London, 1927.
Inge, William Ralph, *Christian Mysticism*, London, 1899.
Inge, William Ralph, *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*, New York, 1907.
James, William, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, Gifford Lectures, 1901–2, New York, 1929.
James, William, *The Will to Believe*, New York, 1923.
James, William, *A Pluralistic Universe*, New York, 1929.
James, William, *Pragmatism*, New York, 1907.
Jones, Rufus Matthew, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, London, 1909.
Jones, Rufus Matthew, *New Studies in Mystical Religion*, New York, 1927.
Kielholz, A., *Jacob Boehme; ein Pathographischer Beitrag zur Psychologie der Mystik. Scriften zur Angewandlten Seelenkunde xvii*, Vienna, 1919.
Kingsland, William, *Rational Mysticism*, London, 1924.
Knight, Rachel, *The Founder of Quakerism, a Psychological Study of the Mysticism of George Fox*, London, 1922.
Koyré, A., *La Philosophie de Jacob Boehme*, Paris, 1929.
Ladd, George Trumbull, *Knowledge, Life and Reality*, N. Y., 1909.
Lamprecht, Sterling, P., *A Type of Religious Mysticism, The Journal of Philosophy*, Dec. 22, 1927.
Law, William, *Memorial of, Notes on the Writings of Jacob Böhme and Others*, London, 1854.
Lehmann, Dr. E., *Mysticism in Heathendom and Christendom*, London, 1910.

Leuba, James H., *Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, New York, 1926.
Macintosh, Douglas Clyde, *The Problem of Knowledge*, New York, 1915.
Martensen, Dr. Hans Lassen, *Life and Teaching of Jacob Boehme*, Translation by T. R. Evans, London, 1886.
Masson, T. L., *New Roads to Happiness, World's Work*, July, 1922.
McCann, D. J. (Editor), *The Cloud of Unknowing—by an English Mystic of the 14th Century*, London, 1924.
McDougall, William, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, New York, 1926.
Moses, Josiah, *Pathological Aspects of Religions*, Worcester, Mass., 1906.
Nordau, Max, *Degeneration*, Translated from the second edition of the German work, New York, 1897.
Patrick, George Thomas White, *The World and Its Meaning*, Boston, 1924.
Pfister, Dr. Oskar, *Some Applications of Psycho-Analysis*, Translation from the German, London, 1923.
Peers, E. Allison, *Spanish Mysticism*, London, 1924.
Pratt, James B., *The Religious Consciousness*, New York, 1920.
Récéjac, E., *Essai sur les Fondements de la Connaissance Mystic*, Paris, 1897.
Riley, Isaac W., *Meaning of Mysticism*, New York, 1930.
Royce, Josiah, *The World and the Individual*, 2 Volumes, New York, 1904.
Royce, Josiah, *Sources of Religious Insight*, New York, 1912.
Royce, Josiah, *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, Boston, 1895.
Russell, Bertrand, *Philosophical Essays*, New York, 1910.
Russell, Bertrand, *Mysticism and Logic*, New York, 1929.
Saturday Review, From Heaven or Men? London, May 9, 1925. *A review of the Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, J. H. Leuba.
Schiller, Ferdinand C. S., *Studies in Humanism*, London, 1907.
Scott, Rev. W. M., *Aspects of Christian Mysticism*, New York, 1907.
Sharpe, A. B., *Mysticism: Its True Nature and Value*, London, 1910.
Sister Gonzaga, *The Mysticism of Johann Goseph Von Gerres as a Reaction Against Rationalism*, Washington, 1920.
Sneath, E. Hershey, *At One with the Invisible*, New York, 1921.
Sturt, Henry Cecil, *Idola Theatri*, London, 1906.
Taylor, Edward, *Jacob Behmen's Theosophick Philosophy Unfolded*, London, 1691.
Thouless, R. H., *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*, New York, 1923.
Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, London, 1911.
Underhill, Evelyn, *Essentials of Mysticism*, New York, 1920.
Underhill, Evelyn, *Ruysbroeck*, London, 1915.
Vaughan, R. A., *Hours with the Mystics*, 2 Volumes, London, 18—.
Vetterling, Dr. Herman, *The Illuminate of Görlitz or Jakob Böhme's Life and Philosophy*. Leipzig, 1923.
Watkins, E. I., *The Philosophy of Mysticism*, New York, 1920.
Whyte, Alexander, *An Appreciation of Jacob Behmen*, London, 1894.

WPC
WESTMINSTER PUBLISHING COMPANY
PHILA.